From: C H Hog Farms Inc
To: Water Permit Application
Subject: Regulation 6 Individual NPDES Permit Application
Date: Thursday, April 12, 2018 9:02:52 PM

Enclosed is C & H Hog Farms, Inc's application for an individual NPDES Permit, pursuant to ADEQ's Decision to not renew the NPDES General CAFO Permit.
Due to file size, the application packet has been split into separate files which will be sent in subsequent emails. A color hard copy will follow in the mail.

C & H would prefer to operate under a Reg 5 Permit and should it be successful in obtaining an acceptable Reg 5 Permit, it will work with ADEQ to terminate coverage under the NPDES General/Individual Permit, as may be appropriate, at that time.

Thank you,
Jason Henson
C & H Hog Farms, Inc.

C & H Hog Farms Inc

Individual NPDES Permit Application

Section 26, T-15-N, R-20-W

Newton County, Arkansas

April 11, 2018

Prepared for:

Jason Henson

HC 72 Box 2

Vendor, AR 72683

Prepared by:

DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC

4200 21st St. SE #101

Mandan, ND 58554

Table of Contents

Section A

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
NPDES PERMIT APPLICATION
FORM 1

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. This form should be **typed or printed in ink**. If insufficient space is available to address any item, please continue on an attached sheet of paper.

2. Please complete the following section(s). If a section is not required, please check the Not Applicable (N/A) box at the top of the section.

Sections	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
POTW	X	X	X	X					X
Industrial User	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Construction Permit Only	X	X	*	X	X			X	X
Modification	X	X	X	X		*	*	X	X
All Other Applicants	X	X	X	X	X				X

* As necessary

3. If you need help on SIC or NAICS go to www.osha.gov/oshstats/sicser.html.

Common SIC and NAICS

Facility Type	SIC Code	NAICS
Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)	4952	221320
Subdivision, Apartment Complex	6552	237210
Mobile Home Park	6515	533190

4. If you have any questions about this form you may call NPDES Section at 501-682-0623 or go to www.adeq.state.ar.us/water. You may also contact :

Department	Information in Regard to	Telephone #
Arkansas Department of Health	Water Supply	501-661-2623

5. The following EPA Forms in addition to Form 1 is required for processing your application:

Form 2A - Municipal Dischargers
Form 2B - Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations
Form 2C - Existing Manufacturing, Commercial, Mining, and Silvicultural Operations
Form 2D - New Sources and New Dischargers Application for Permit to Discharge Process Wastewater
Form 2E - Facilities Which Do Not Discharge Process Wastewater (i.e. Domestic, Non contact cooling water)
Form 2F - Application for Permit to Discharge Storm Water Discharges Associated With Industrial Activity

6. Where to Submit

Return the completed form by mail to:

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
Permits Branch, Office of Water Quality

5301 Northshore Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72118

Or by email to:

Water.Permit.Application@adeq.state.ar.us

NPDES PERMIT APPLICATION

FORM 1

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
OFFICE OF WATER QUALITY
5301 Northshore Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72118-5317
www.adeq.state.ar.us/water

PURPOSE OF THIS APPLICATION

- ☐ INITIAL PERMIT APPLICATION FOR NEW FACILITY
- ☒ INITIAL PERMIT APPLICATION FOR EXISTING FACILITY
- ☐ MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PERMIT
- ☐ REISSUANCE (RENEWAL) OF EXISTING PERMIT
- ☐ MODIFICATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF EXISTING PERMIT
- ☐ CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

SECTION A- GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Legal Applicant Name (The permit will be issued under this name. This is the entity that controls and is responsible for operations and compliance.):

   C & H Hog Farms, Inc.

   Note: The legal name of the applicant must be identical to the name listed with the Arkansas Secretary of State.

2. Operator Type: Private ☐ State ☐ Federal ☐ Partnership ☐ Corporation ☒ Other ☐

   State of Incorporation: Arkansas

3. Facility Name: C & H Hog Farms, Inc.

4. Is the legal applicant identified in number 1 above, the owner of the facility? ☒ Yes ☐ No

5. NPDES Permit Number (If Applicable): AR00 ____

6. NPDES General Permit Number (If Applicable): ARG590001

7. NPDES General Storm Water Permit Number (If Applicable): ____

8. Permit Numbers and/or names of any permits issued by ADEQ or EPA for an activity located in Arkansas that is presently held by the applicant or its parent or subsidiary corporation which are not listed above:

Permit Name	Permit Number	Held by

9. Give driving directions to the wastewater treatment plant with respect to known landmarks:

   The location for this facility is approximately 1.6 mi west of Mt. Judea, AR in Newton County. Driving directions from Mt. Judea are approximately 0.8 mi southwest on County Rd 54 and right on County Rd 41 for approximately 0.75 mi. The site is located on the left hand side of the road.

10. Facility Physical Location: (Attach a map with location marked; street, route no. or other specific identifier)

    Street: HC 72 Box 2

City: Vendor County: Newton State: Arkansas Zip: 72683

11. Facility Mailing Address for permit, DMR, and invoice (Street or Post Office Box):

Name: C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Title:

Street: HC 72 Box 2 P.O. Box

City: Vendor State: AR Zip: 72683

E-mail address*: chhogfarmsinc@outlook.com Fax:

* Is emailing all documents (permit, letters, DMRs, invoices, etc.) acceptable to the applicant? ☒ Yes ☐ No

12. Neighboring States Within 20 Miles of the permitted facility (Check all that apply):

Oklahoma ☐ Missouri ☐ Tennessee ☐ Louisiana ☐ Texas ☐ Mississippi ☐

13. Indicate applicable Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Codes and NAICS codes for primary processes (See Item #3 of the instructions for assistance in determining the correct SIC and NAICS Codes):

0213 SIC Facility Activity under this SIC or NAICS:

112210 NAICS

14. Design Flow: _____ MGD Highest Monthly Average of the last two years Flow: _____ MGD

15. Is the outfall equipped with a diffuser? ☐ Yes ☐ No

16. Responsible Official (as described on the last page of this application):

Name: Jason Henson Title: President

Address: HC 72 Box 2 Phone Number: 870-434-5004

E-mail Address: chhogfarmsinc@outlook.com

City: Vendor State: AR Zip: 72683

17. Cognizant Official (Duly Authorized Representative of responsible official as described on the last page of this application):

Name: Philip Campbell Title: Secretary

Address: HC 72 Box 2 Phone Number: 870-434-5004

E-mail Address: chhogfarmsinc@outlook.com

City: Vendor State: AR Zip: 72683

18. Name, address and telephone number of active consulting engineer firm (If none, so state):

Contact Name: Nathan Pesta

Company Name: DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC

Address: 4200 21st St. SE Unit 101 Phone Number: 701-663-1116

E-mail Address: nate@dgaengineering.com

City: Mandan State: ND Zip: 58554

19. Wastewater Operator Information

Wastewater Operator Name: License number:

Class of municipal wastewater operator: I ☐ II ☐ III ☐ IV ☐

Class of industrial wastewater operator: Basic ☐ Advanced ☐

SECTION B: FACILITY AND OUTFALL INFORMATION

1. Facility Location (All information must be based on the **front door (gate)** location of the facility):

Lat: 35 ° 55 ' 13.60 " Long: -93 ° 4.0 ' 51.00 " County: Newton Nearest Mt. Town: Judea

2. **Outfall** Location (The location of the end of the pipe discharge point.):

Outfall No. N/A:

Latitude: _____ ° _____ ' _____ " Longitude: _____ ° _____ ' _____ "

Description of outfall location: _____

Name of Receiving Stream (i.e. an unnamed tributary of Mill Creek, thence into Mill Creek; thence into Arkansas River):

N/A

Outfall No. _____:

Latitude: _____ ° _____ ' _____ " Longitude: _____ ° _____ ' _____ "

Description of outfall location: _____

Name of Receiving Stream (i.e. an unnamed tributary of Mill Creek, thence into Mill Creek; thence into Arkansas River):

3. **Monitoring** Location (If the monitoring is conducted at a location different than the above **Outfall** location):

Outfall No. _____:

Lat: _____ ° _____ ' _____ " Long: _____ ° _____ ' _____ "

Outfall No. _____:

Lat: _____ ° _____ ' _____ " Long: _____ ° _____ ' _____ "

Outfall No. _____:

Lat: _____ ° _____ ' _____ " Long: _____ ° _____ ' _____ "

4. Type of Treatment system (Include all components of the treatment system and attach the process flow diagram):

Manure will be stored in Storage Ponds 1 & 2 and from there will be land applied on Fields 1-17 as shown in the NMP.

5. **FLOW AND SAMPLE MEASUREMENT**

How are effluent samples collected?

_____

_____

How is flow measured, i.e., v-notch weir, totalizing meter, Parshall flume, etc.?

_____

_____

6. Is the proposed or existing facility located above the 100-year flood level? ☒ Yes ☐ No

NOTE: FEMA Map must be included with this application. Maps can be ordered at www.fema.gov . (No Fema study has been completed at this time.)

If "No", what measures are (or will be) used to protect the facility? _____

7. Population for Municipal and Domestic Sewer Systems: _____

8. Backup Power Generation for Treatment Plants

Are there any permanent backup generators? Yes ☐ No ☐

If Yes, how many? _____ Total Horsepower (hp)? _____

If no, please explain. Include a description of how the WWTP will be restarted and actions taken to ensure compliance with permit limits once power is restored.

_____

SECTION C – WASTE STORAGE AND DISPOSAL INFORMATION

1. Sludge Disposal Method (Check as many as are applicable):

☐ **Landfill**

Landfill Site Name _____ ADEQ Solid Waste Permit No. _____

☒ **Land Application:** ADEQ State Permit No. ARG590001

☐ **Septic tank** Arkansas Department of Health Permit No.: _____

☐ **Distribution and Marketing**: Facility receiving sludge:

Name: _____ Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____ Phone: _____

Rail: ☐ _____ Pipe: ☐ _____ Other: _____

☐ **Subsurface Disposal** (Lagoon for which the sole purpose is storing sludge):

Location of lagoon _____ How old is the lagoon? _____

Surface area of lagoon: _____ Acre Depth: _____ ft Does lagoon have a liner? ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ **Incineration:** Location of incinerator _____

☐ **Remains in Treatment Lagoon(s):** N/A

How old is the lagoon(s)? _____ Has sludge depth been measured? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, Date measured? _____ Sludge Depth? _____ ft If No, When will it be measured? _____

Has sludge ever been removed? Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, When was it removed? _____

☐ **Other** (Provide complete description): _____

SECTION D - WATER SUPPLY

Water Sources which are downstream of the outfall location, i.e., those which could be affected by the discharge from this facility (check as many as are applicable):

☒ **Private Well** - Distance from Discharge point: ☒ Within 5 miles ☐ Within 50 miles

☐ **Municipal Water Utility** (Specify City): _____

Distance from Discharge point: ☐ Within 5 miles ☐ Within 50 miles

☐ **Surface Water-** Name of Surface Water Source: _____

Distance from Discharge point: ☐ Within 5 miles ☐ Within 50 miles

Lat: _____ ° _____ ' _____ " Long: _____ ° _____ ' _____ "

☐ **Other** (Specify): _____

Distance from Discharge point: ☐ Within 5 miles ☐ Within 50 miles

NOT APPLICABLE (N/A): ☐

SECTION E: TRUST FUND REQUIREMENTS AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

1. Ark. Code Ann. § 8-4-203(b)(1)(A) forbids the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality from issuing, modifying, renewing, or transferring a permit for a nonmunicipal domestic sewage treatment works without the applicant first fulfilling the trust fund requirements set forth in that section. Ark. Code Ann. § 8-4-203(b)(1)(B) defines "nonmunicipal domestic sewage treatment works" as a device or system operated by an entity other than a city, town, or county that treats, in whole or in part, waste or wastewater from humans or household operations and must continually operate to protect human health and the environment despite a permittee's failure to maintain or operate the device or system. NDSTW's can include, but are not limited to:
    - Sewer Improvement Districts;
    - Subdivisions,
    - Mobile Home Parks,
    - Property Owner' Associates,
    - RV parks, and
    - Apartments

    Exclusions Excluded from this application's Section E.1. requirements for trust fund contribution fees are:
    - State or federal facilities,
    - Schools,
    - Universities and colleges,
    - Entities that continuously operate due to a connection with a city, town, or county, and
    - Commercial or industrial entity that treats domestic sewage from its operations and does not accept domestic sewage from other entities or residences.

    The trust fund form may be obtained from the ADEQ web site at:

    https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/water/permits/npdes/individual/pdfs/ndstw-trust-fund-certification-form.pdf

2. Disclosure Statement:

    Ark. Code Ann. 8-1-106 requires that applicants for any type of permit or transfer of any permit, license, certification or operational authority issued by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) file a Disclosure Statement with their application unless exempt for doing so under Ark. Code Ann. §8-1-106(b)(2). The filing of a Disclosure Statement is mandatory. No application can be considered administratively complete without a completed Disclosure Statement unless that facility is exempt. Publicly traded companies may submit the most recent 10k and 10Q filings to the Securities and Exchange Commission in lieu of the Disclosure Statement. The form may be obtained from the ADEQ web site at:

    https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/ADEQ_Disclosure_Statement.pdf

NOT APPLICABLE (N/A): ☒

SECTION F – INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY

1. Does an effluent guideline limitation promulgated by EPA (Link to a Listing of the 40 CFR Effluent Limit Guidelines) under Section 304 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) apply to your facility?

   YES ☐ (Answer questions 2 and 3) NO ☐

2. What Part of 40 CFR? _____

3. What Subpart(s)? _____ _____

4. Give a brief description of all operations at this facility including primary products or services (attach additional sheets if necessary):

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Production: (projected for new facilities)

Product(s) Manufactured	Last 12 Months lbs/day*		Highest Production Year of Last 5 Years lbs/day*	
(Brand name)	Highest Month	Days of Operation	Monthly Average	Days of Operation

* These units could be off-lbs, lbs quenched, lbs cleaned/etched/rinsed, lbs poured, lbs extruded, etc.

NOT APPLICABLE (N/A): ☒

SECTION G - WASTEWATER DISCHARGE INFORMATION

Facilities that checked "Yes" in question 1 of Section F are considered Categorical Industrial Users and should skip to question 2.

1. **For Non-Categorical Users Only**: List average wastewater discharge, maximum discharge, and type of discharge (batch, continuous, or both), for each plant process. Include the reference number from the process flow schematic (reference Figure 1) that corresponds to each process. [New facilities should provide estimates for each discharge.]

No.	Process Description	Average Flow (GPD)	Maximum Flow (GPD)	Type of Discharge (batch, continuous, none)

If batch discharge occurs or will occur, indicate: [New facilities may estimate.]

Number of batch discharges: _____ per day Average discharge per batch: (GPD)

Time of batch discharges _____ (days of week) at _____ (hours of day)

Flow rate: _____ gallons/minute Percent of total discharge: _____

Answer questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 only if you are subject to Categorical Standards.

2. For Categorical Users: Provide the wastewater discharge flows for each of your processes or proposed processes. Include the reference number from the process flow schematic (reference Figure 1) that corresponds to each process. [Note: 1) New facilities should provide estimates for each discharge and 2) Facilities should denote whether the flow was measured or estimated.]

No.	Regulated Process	Average Flow (GPD)	Maximum Flow (GPD)	Type of Discharge (batch, continuous, none)

No.	Unregulated Process	Average Flow (GPD)	Maximum Flow (GPD)	Type of Discharge (batch, continuous, none)

No.	Dilution (e.g., Cooling Water)	Average Flow (GPD)	Maximum Flow (GPD)	Type of Discharge (batch, continuous, none)

If batch discharge occurs or will occur, indicate: [New facilities may estimate.]

Number of batch discharges: _____ per day Average discharge per batch: (GPD)

Time of batch discharges _____ (days of week) at _____ (hours of day)

Flow rate: _____ gallons/minute Percent of total discharge: _____

3. Do you have, or plan to have, automatic sampling equipment or continuous wastewater flow metering equipment at this facility?

Current:	Flow Metering	☐	Yes	Type: _____	☐	No	☐	N/A ☐
	Sampling Equipment	☐	Yes	Type: _____	☐	No	☐	N/A ☐
Planned:	Flow Metering	☐	Yes	Type: _____	☐	No	☐	N/A ☐
	Sampling Equipment	☐	Yes	Type: _____	☐	No	☐	N/A ☐

If yes, please indicate the present or future location of this equipment on the sewer schematic and describe the equipment below:

_____

_____

_____

4. Are any process changes or expansions planned during the next three years that could alter wastewater volumes or characteristics?

☐ Yes ☐ No (If no, skip Question 5)

5. Briefly describe these changes and their effects on the wastewater volume and characteristics:

_____

_____

_____

NOT APPLICABLE (N/A): ☒

SECTION H -TECHNICAL INFORMATION

Technical information to support this application shall be furnished in appropriate detail to understand the project. Information in this Part is required for obtaining a **construction permit** or for **modification** of the treatment system.

1. Describe the treatment system. Include the types of control equipment to be installed along with their methods of operation and control efficiency.

_____

_____

_____

2. One set of construction plans and specifications, approved (Signed and stamped) by a **Professional Engineer** (PE) registered in **Arkansas**, must be submitted as follows:

    a. The plans must show flow rates in addition to pertinent dimensions so that detention times, overflow rates, and loadings per acre, etc. can be calculated.
    b. Specifications and complete design calculations.
    c. All treated wastewater discharges should have a flow measuring device such as a weir or Parshall flume installed. Where there is a significant difference between the flow rates of the raw and treated wastewater, a flow measuring device should be provided both before and after treatment.

3. If this application includes a construction permit disturbing five or more acres, a storm water construction permit must be obtained by submitting a notice of intent (NOI) to ADEQ.

SECTION I: SIGNATORY REQUIREMENTS

Cognizant Official (Duly Authorized Representative)

40 CFR 122.22(b) states that all reports required by the permit, or other information requested by the Director, shall be signed by the applicant (or person authorized by the applicant) or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

(1) the authorization is made in writing by the applicant (or person authorized by the applicant);
(2) the authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company.

The applicant hereby designates the following person as a Cognizant Official, or duly authorized representative, for signing reports, etc., including Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR) required by the permit, and other information requested by the Director:

Signature of Cognizant Official: Philip Campbell Date: 4/5/18

Printed name of Cognizant Official: Philip Campbell

Official title of Cognizant Official: Secretary Telephone Number: 870-434-5004

Responsible Official

The information contained in this form must be certified by a ***responsible official*** as defined in the "signatory requirements for permit applications" (40 CFR 122.22).

Responsible official is defined as follows:

Corporation, a principal officer of at least the level of vice president
Partnership, a general partner
Sole proprietorship: the proprietor
Municipal, state, federal, or other public facility: principal executive officer, or ranking elected official.

JH *(Initial)* "I certify that the cognizant official designated above is qualified to act as a duly authorized representative under the provisions of 40 CFR 122.22(b)." NOTE: If no duly authorized representative is designated in this section, the Department considers the applicant to be the responsible official for the facility and only reports, etc., signed by the applicant will be accepted by the Department.

JH *(Initial)* "I certify that, if this facility is a corporation, it is registered with the Secretary of State in Arkansas. Please provide the full name of the corporation if different than that listed in Section A above."

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations. I further certify under penalty of law that all analyses reported as less than detectable in this application or attachments thereto were performed using the EPA approved test method having the lowest detection limit for the substance tested."

Signature of Responsible Official: Jason Henson Date: 4/5/18

Printed name of Responsible Official: Jason Henson

Official title of Responsible Official: President Telephone Number: 870-434-5004

Disclaimer

This is an updated PDF document that allows you to type your information directly into the form, print it, and save the completed form.

Note: This form can be viewed and saved only using Adobe Acrobat Reader version 7.0 or higher, or if you have the full Adobe Professional version.

Instructions:

1. Type in your information
2. Save file (if desired)
3. Print the completed form
4. Sign and date the printed copy
5. Mail it to the directed contact.

Form Approved
OMB No. 2040-0250

EPA I.D. NUMBER (*copy from Item 1 of Form 1*)

FORM 2B NPDES

EPA

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
APPLICATIONS FOR PERMIT TO DISCHARGE WASTEWATER
CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS AND AQUATIC ANIMAL PRODUCTION FACILITIES

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Applying for: Individual Permit ☒ Coverage Under General Permit ☐

A. TYPE OF BUSINESS	B. CONTACT INFORMATION	C. FACILITY OPERATION STATUS
☒ 1. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (complete items B, C, D, and section II) ☐ 2. Concentrated Aquatic Animal Production Facility (complete items B, C, and section III)	Owner/or Operator Name: C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Telephone: (870) 434-5004 Address: HC 72 Box 2 Facsimile: ( ) City: Vendor State: AR Zip Code: 72683	☒ 1. Existing Facility ☐ 2. Proposed Facility

D. FACILITY INFORMATION

Name: C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Telephone: (870) 434-5004
Address: HC 72 Box 2 Facsimile: ( )
City: Vendor State: AR Zip Code: 72683
County: Newton Latitude: Longitude:

If contract operation: Name of Integrator: JBS Pork
Address of Integrator: 1770 Promontory Circle, Greeley, CO 80634

II. CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATION CHARACTERISTICS

A. TYPE AND NUMBER OF ANIMALS

1. TYPE	2. ANIMALS: NO. IN OPEN CONFINEMENT	2. ANIMALS: NO. HOUSED UNDER ROOF
☐ Mature Dairy Cows		
☐ Dairy Heifers		
☐ Veal Calves		
☐ Cattle (not dairy or veal calves)		
☒ Swine (55 lbs. or over)		2,503
☒ Swine (under 55 lbs.)		4,000
☐ Horses		
☐ Sheep or Lambs		
☐ Turkeys		
☐ Chickens (Broilers)		
☐ Chickens (Layers)		
☐ Ducks		
☐ Other: Specify _____		
3. TOTAL ANIMALS		6,503

B. MANURE, LITTER, AND/OR WASTEWATER PRODUCTION AND USE

1. How much manure, litter, and wastewater is generated annually by the facility? _____ tons 2,090,181 gallons
2. If land applied how many acres of land under the control of the applicant are available for applying the CAFOs manure/litter/wastewater? 630.7 acres
3. How many tons of manure or litter, or gallons of wastewater produced by the CAFO will be transferred annually to other persons? _____ tons 0 to 2,090,181 gallons

C. ☒ TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

D. TYPE OF CONTAINMENT, STORAGE AND CAPACITY

1. Type of Containment	Total Capacity (in gallons)
☐ Lagoon	
☒ Holding Pond	2,352,931
☐ Evaporation Pond	
☒ Other: Specify Shallow Pit-Pull-Plug	759,542

2. Report the total number of acres contributing drainage: 0 acres

3. Type of Storage	Total Number of Days	Total Capacity (gallons/tons)
☐ Anaerobic Lagoon		
☐ Storage Lagoon		
☐ Evaporation Pond		
☐ Aboveground Storage Tanks		
☐ Belowground Storage Tanks		
☐ Roofed Storage Shed		
☐ Concrete Pad		
☐ Impervious Soil Pad		
☐ Other: Specify _____		

E. NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Note: Effective February 27, 2009, a permit application is not complete until a nutrient management plan is submitted to the Permitting Authority.

1. Please indicate whether a nutrient management plan has been included with this permit application. ☒ Yes ☐ No

2. If no, please explain:

3. Is a nutrient management plan being implemented for the facility? ☒ Yes ☐ No

4. The date of the last review or revision of the nutrient management plan. Date: 04/11/18

5. If not land applying, describe alternative use(s) of manure, litter, and/or wastewater:

F. LAND APPLICATION BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Please check any of the following best management practices that are being implemented at the facility to control runoff and protect water quality:

☒ Buffers ☒ Setbacks ☐ Conservation tillage ☐ Constructed wetlands ☐ Infiltration field ☒ Grass filter ☐ Terrace

Form Approved
OMB No. 2040-0250

III. CONCENTRATED AQUATIC ANIMAL PRODUCTION FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS

A. For each outfall give the maximum daily flow, maximum 30-day flow, and the long-term average flow.

B. Indicate the total number of ponds, raceways, and similar structures in your facility.

1. Outfall No.	2. Flow (*gallons per day*)			B. 1. Ponds	B. 2. Raceways	B. 3. Other
	a. Maximum. Daily	b. Maximum 30 Day	c. Long Term Average			

C. Provide the name of the receiving water and the source of water used by your facility.

1. Receiving Water	2. Water Source

D. List the species of fish or aquatic animals held and fed at your facility. For each species, give the total weight produced by your facility per year in pounds of harvestable weight, and also give the maximum weight present at any one time.

1. Cold Water Species			2. Warm Water Species		
a. Species	b. Harvestable Weight (*pounds*)		a. Species	b. Harvestable Weight (*pounds*)	
	(1) Total Yearly	(2) Maximum		(1) Total Yearly	(2) Maximum

E. Report the total pounds of food during the calendar month of maximum feeding.	1. Month	2. Pounds of Food

IV. CERTIFICATION

I certify under penalty of law that I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted in this application and all attachments and that, based on my inquiry of those individuals immediately responsible for obtaining the information, I believe that the information is true accurate and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment.

A. Name and Official Title (*print or type*)	B. Telephone (870) 434-5004
Jason Henson, President	
C. Signature: Jason Henson	D. Date Signed: 4/5/18

INSTRUCTIONS

GENERAL

This form must be completed by all applicants who check "yes" to Item II-B in Form 1. Not all animal feeding operations or fish farms are required to obtain NPDES permits. Exclusions are based on size and whether or not the facility discharges proposed to discharge. *See* the description of these exclusions in the CAFO regulations at 40 CFR 122.23.

For aquatic animal production facilities, the size cutoffs are based on whether the species are warm water or cold water, on the production weight per year in harvestable pounds, and on the amount of feeding in pounds of food (*for cold water species*). Also, facilities which discharge less than 30 days per year, or only during periods of excess runoff (*for warm water fish*) are not required to have a permit.

Refer to the Form 1 instructions to determine where to file this form.

Item I-A

See the note above to be sure that your facility is a "concentrated animal feeding operation" (CAFO).

Item I-B

Use this space to give owner/operator contact information.

Item I-C

Check "proposed" if your facility is not now in operation or is expanding to meet the definition of a CAFO in accordance with the CAFO regulations at 40 CFR 122.23.

Item I-D

Use this space to give a complete legal description of your facility's location including name, address, and latitude/longitude. Also, if a contract grower, the name and address of the integrator.

Item II

Supply all information in item II if you checked (1) in item I-A.

Item II-A

Give the maximum number of each type of animal in open confinement or housed under roof (either partially or totally) which are held at your facility for a total of 45 days or more in any 12 month period. Provide the total number of animals confined at the facility.

Item II-B

Provide the total amount of manure, litter, and wastewater generated annually by the facility. Identify if manure, litter, and wastewater generated by the facility is to be land applied and the number of acres, under the control of the CAFO operator, suitable for land application. If the answer to question 3 is yes, provide the estimated annual quantity of manure, litter, and wastewater that the applicant plans to transfer off-site.

Item II-C

Check this box if you have submitted a topographic map of the entire operation, including the production area and land under the operational control of the CAFO operator where manure, litter, and/or wastewater are applied with Form 1.

Item II-D

1. Provide information on the type of containment and the capacity of the containment structure (s).
2. The number of acres that are drained and collected in the containment structure (s).
3. Identify the type of storage for the manure, litter, and/or wastewater. Give the capacity of this storage in days.

Item II-E

Provide information concerning the status of submitting a nutrient management plan for the facility to complete the application. In those cases where the nutrient management plan has not been submitted, provide an explanation. If not land applying, describe the alternative uses of the manure, litter, and wastewater (*e.g.*, composting, pelletizing, energy generation, etc.).

Item II-F

Check any of the identified conservation practices that are being implemented at the facility to control runoff and protect water quality.

Item III

Supply all information in Item III if you checked (2) in Item I-A.

Item III-A

Outfalls should be numbered to correspond with the map submitted in Item XI of Form 1. Values given for flow should be representative of your normal operation. The maximum daily flow is the maximum measured flow occurring over a calendar day. The maximum 30-day flow is the average of measured daily flow over the calendar month of highest flow. The long-term average flow is the average of measure daily flows over a calendar year.

Item III-B

Give the total number of discrete ponds or raceways in your facility. Under "other," give a descriptive name of any structure which is not a pond or a raceway but which results in discharge to waters of the United States.

Item III-C

Use names for receiving water and source of water which correspond to the map submitted in Item XI of Form 1.

Item III-D

The names of fish species should be proper, common, or scientific names as given in special Publication No. 6 of the American Fisheries Society. "A List of Common and Scientific Names of Fishes from the United States and Canada." The values given for total weight produced by your facility per year and the maximum weight present at any one time should be representative of your normal operation.

Item III-E

The value given for maximum monthly pounds of food should be representative of your normal operation.

Item IV

The Clean Water Act provides for severe penalties for submitting false information on this application form.

Section 309(C)(2) of the Clean Water Act provides that "Any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any application...shall upon conviction, be punished by a fine of no more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or both."

Federal regulations require the certification to be signed as follows:

A. For corporation, by a principal executive officer of at least the level of vice president.

B. For a partnership or sole proprietorship, by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively; or

C. For a municipality, State, federal, or other public facility, by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official.

Paper Reduction Act Notice

The public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 9.5 hours per response. The public reporting and recordkeeping burden for development of the nutrient management plan to be submitted with the form is estimated to average 58 hours per response. Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques to the Director, Collection Strategies Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2822T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Include the OMB control number in any correspondence. Do not send the completed form to this address.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Arkansas Code Annotated Section 8-1-106 requires that all applicants for the issuance, or transfer of any permit, license, certification or operational authority issued by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) file a disclosure statement with their applications. The filing of a disclosure statement is mandatory. No application can be considered complete without one.

Disclosure statement means a written statement by the applicant that contains:

- The full name and business address of the applicant and all affiliated persons;
- The full name and business address of any legal entity in which the applicant holds a debt or equity interest of at least five percent (5%) or that is a parent company or subsidiary of the applicant, and a description of the ongoing organizational relationships as they may impact operations within the state;
- A description of the experience and credentials of the applicant, including any past or present permits, licenses, certifications, or operational authorizations relating to environmental regulation;
- A listing and explanation of any civil or criminal legal actions by government agencies involving environmental protection laws or regulations against the applicant and affiliated persons in the ten (10) years immediately preceding the filing of the application, including administrative enforcement actions resulting in the imposition of sanctions, permit or license revocations or denials issued by any state or federal authority, actions that have resulted in a finding or a settlement of a violation, and actions that are pending;
- A listing of any federal environmental agency and any other environmental agency outside this state that has or has had regulatory responsibility over the applicant; and
- Any other information the Director of the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality may require that relates to the competency, reliability, or responsibility of the applicant and affiliated persons.

Exemptions:

The following persons or entities are not required to file a disclosure statement:

- Governmental entities, consisting only of subdivisions or agencies of the federal government, agencies of the state government, counties, municipalities, or duly authorized regional solid waste authorities as defined by § 8-6-702. (This exemption shall not extend to improvement districts or any other subdivision of government which is not specifically instituted by an act of the General Assembly.)
- Applicants for a general permit to be issued by the department pursuant to its authority to implement the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System for storm water discharge.
- If the applicant is a publicly held company required to file periodic reports under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 or a wholly owned subsidiary of a publicly held company, the applicant shall not be required to submit a disclosure statement, but shall submit the most recent annual and quarterly reports required by the Securities and Exchange Commission which provide information regarding legal proceedings in which the applicant has been involved. The applicant shall submit such other information as the director may require that relates to the competency, reliability, or responsibility of the applicant and affiliated persons.

Exemptions continued:

The following permits, licenses, certifications, and operational authorizations are also exempt from submitting a disclosure statement:

- Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Permit Modifications (Class 1, 2, and 3), as defined in Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission (APC&EC) Regulation 23;
- Phase 1 Consultants, as defined in APC&EC Regulation 32;
- Certifications for Operators of Commercial Hazardous Waste Facilities, as defined in APC&EC Regulation 23 § 264.16(f);
- Regulated Storage Tank Contractor or Individual License Renewals as defined in APC&EC Regulation 12;
- Certifications for Persons Operating and Maintaining Underground Storage Tank Systems which Contain Regulated Substances, as defined in APC&EC Regulation 12.701, et. seq.;
- Individual Homeowners seeking coverage under General Permit ARG5500000; Wastewater Operator Licenses, as defined in APC&EC Regulation 3;
- Water Permit Modifications for permits issued under the authority of the Arkansas Water and Air Pollution Control Act (Ark. Code Ann. §8-4-101, et. seq.);
- Solid Waste Permit Modifications for permits issued under APC&EC Regulation 22; Solid Waste Landfill Operator License Renewals, as defined in Regulation No. 27;
- Air Permit Modifications for permits issued under APC&EC Regulations 18, 19, and 26; and Asbestos Certification Renewals, as defined in Regulation 21.

Deliberate falsification or omission of relevant information from disclosure statements shall be grounds for civil or criminal enforcement action or administrative denial of a permit, license, certification, or operational authorization.

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Instructions for the Completion of this Document:

A. Individuals, firms or other legal entities with no changes to an ADEQ Disclosure Statement, complete items 1 through 5 and 18.

B. Individuals who never submitted an ADEQ Disclosure Statement, complete items 1 through 4, 6, 7, and 16 through 18.

C. Firms or other legal entities who never submitted an ADEQ Disclosure Statement, complete 1 through 4, and 6 through 18.

If Not Submitting by ePortal, Mail Original to:
ADEQ
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
[*List Proper Division(s)*]
5301 Northshore Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72118-5317

1. APPLICANT: (Full Name)
C & H Hog Farms, Inc.

2. MAILING ADDRESS: (Number and Street, P.O.Box Or Rural Route)
HC 72 Box 2

3. CITY, STATE, AND ZIPCODE:
Vendor, AR 72683

4a. Applicant Type:

○ Individual ◉ Corporate or Other Entity

4b. Reason for Submission:

☑ Permit ☐ License ☐ Certification ☐ Operational Authority

☑ New Application ☐ Modification ☐ Renewal Application (If no changes from previous disclosure statement, complete number 5 and 18.)

4c. Programs:

☐ Air ☑ Water ☐ Hazardous Waste ☐ Regulated Storage Tank ☐ Mining ☐ Solid Waste ☐ Used Tire Program

5. Declaration of No Changes:
The violation history, experience and credentials, involvement in current or pending environmental lawsuits, civil and criminal, have not changed since the last Disclosure Statement that was filed with ADEQ on _____

6. Describe the experience and credentials of the Applicant, including the receipt of any past or present permits, licenses, certifications or operational authorization relating to environmental regulation. (Attach additional pages, if necessary.)

C & H Hog Farms, Inc. currently operates in full compliance with state and federal regulations and holds a Regulation 6 General Permit, ARG590001. The farm has been in operation for approximately five (5) years with no violations or enforcement actions. Prior to that, Richard Campbell and Philip Campbell jointly owned and operated C & C Hog Barn for twelve (12) years. C & C Hog Barn held a Regulation 5 Permit, 3540-WR-5.

7. List and explain all civil or criminal legal actions by government agencies involving environmental protection laws or regulations against the Applicant * in the last ten (10) years including:

1. Administrative enforcement actions resulting in the imposition of sanctions;
2. Permit or license revocations or denials issued by any state or federal authority;
3. Actions that have resulted in a finding or a settlement of a violation; and
4. Pending actions.

(Attach additional pages, if necessary.)

There have been no civil or criminal legal actions by government agencies against C & H Hog Farms, Inc.

C & H Hog Farms, Inc. applied for a Regulation 5 permit in April 2016. The permit application was subsequently denied by ADEQ and is currently in the appeals process.

* Firms or other legal entities shall also include this information for all persons and legal entities identified in sections 8-16 of this Disclosure Statement.

8. List all officers of the Applicant. (add additional pages, if necessary.)

NAME: Jason Henson TITLE: President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Richard Campbell TITLE: Vice-President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Philip Campbell TITLE: Secretary
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

9. List all directors of the Applicant. (Add additional pages, if necessary.)

NAME: Jason Henson TITLE: President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Richard Campbell TITLE: Vice-President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Philip Campbell TITLE: Secretary
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

10. List all partners of the Applicant. (Add additional pages, if necessary.)

NAME: Jason Henson TITLE: President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Richard Campbell TITLE: Vice-President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Philip Campbell TITLE: Secretary
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

11. List all persons employed by the Applicant in a supervisory capacity or with authority over operations of the facility subject to this application.

NAME: Jason Henson TITLE: President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Richard Campbell TITLE: Vice-President
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Philip Campbell TITLE: Secretary
STREET: HC 72 Box 2
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

12. List all persons or legal entities, who own or control more than five percent (5%) of the Applicant's debt or equity.

NAME: Jason Henson TITLE: President

STREET: HC 72 Box 2

CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Richard Campbell TITLE: Vice-President

STREET: HC 72 Box 2

CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

NAME: Philip Campbell TITLE: Secretary

STREET: HC 72 Box 2

CITY, STATE, ZIP: Vendor, AR 72683

13. List all legal entities, in which the Applicant holds a debt or equity interest of more than five percent (5%).

NAME: _____ TITLE: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

NAME: _____ TITLE: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

NAME: _____ TITLE: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

14. List any parent company of the Applicant. Describe the parent company's ongoing organizational relationship with the Applicant.

NAME: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

Organizational Relationship:

15. List any subsidiary of the Applicant. Describe the subsidiary's ongoing organizational relationship with the Applicant.

NAME: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

Organizational Relationship:

16. List any person who is not now in compliance or has a history of noncompliance with the environmental law or regulations of this state or any other jurisdiction and who through relationship by blood or marriage or through any other relationship could be reasonably expected to significantly influence the Applicant in a manner which could adversely affect the environment.

NAME: _____ TITLE: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

NAME: _____ TITLE: _____

STREET: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

17. List all federal environmental agencies and any other environmental agencies outside this state that have or have had regulatory responsibility over the Applicant.

18. VERIFICATION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Applicant agrees to provide any other information the director of the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality may require at any time to comply with the provisions of the Disclosure Law and any regulations promulgated thereto. The Applicant further agrees to provide the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality with any changes, modifications, deletions, additions or amendments to any part of this Disclosure Statement as they occur by filing an amended Disclosure Statement.

DELIBERATE FALSIFICATION OR OMISSION OF RELEVANT INFORMATION FROM DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS SHALL BE GROUNDS FOR CIVIL OR CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT ACTION OR ADMINISTRATIVE DENIAL OF A PERMIT, LICENSE, CERTIFICATION OR OPERATIONAL AUTHORIZATION.

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF SUBMITTING OTHER THAN BY EPORTAL:

I, Jason Henson, certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fines and imprisonment for knowing violation.

APPLICANT SIGNATURE: Jason Henson

TITLE: President

DATE: 4/5/18

Section B

DGA
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WWW.DGAENGINEERING.COM

Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

For

C&H Hog Farms

Newton County, AR

Prepared by DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC,

April 2018

Nutrient Management Plan
Table of Contents

Section A: Introduction

Nutrient Management Plan

The Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) is an important part of the conservation management system (CMS) for your Animal Feeding Operation (AFO). This NMP documents the planning decisions and operation and maintenance for the animal feeding operation. It includes background information and provides guidance, reference information and Web-based sites where up-to-date information can be obtained. Refer to the Producer Activity document for information about day-to-day management activities and recordkeeping. Both this document and the Producer Activity document shall remain in the possession of the producer/landowner.

Farm contact information: C&H Hog Farms, 870-434-5004
HC 72 Box 2
Vendor, AR 72683

Latitude/Longitude: 35, 55', 13.60" & -93, 4' 51.0"
Plan Period: 2018-2023
Animal Type: Swine
Animal Units: 999

Owner/Operator

As the owner/operator of this NMP, I, as the decision maker, have been involved in the planning process and agree that the items/practices listed in each element of the NMP are needed. I understand that I am responsible for keeping all the necessary records associated with the implementation of this NMP. It is my intention to implement/accomplish this NMP in a timely manner as described in the plan.

Signature: Jason Henson Date: 4-11-18
Name: Jason Henson

Conservation Planner

As a Conservation Planner, I certify that I have reviewed both the Nutrient Management Plan and Producer Nutrient Management Activities documents for technical adequacy and that the elements of the documents are technically compatible, reasonable and can be implemented.

Signature: Nathan A. Pesta Date: 4/11/18
Name: Nathan A. Pesta, P.E.
Title: Senior Project Engineer

Manure and Wastewater Handling and Storage

Signature: Nathan A. Pesta Date: 4/11/18
Name: Nathan A. Pesta, P.E.
Title: Senior Project Engineer

Nutrient Management

The Nutrient Management component of this plan meets the AR Nutrient Management 590 Practice Standard.

Signature: Nathan A. Pesta Date: 4/11/18
Name: Nathan A. Pesta P.E.
Title: TSP Certified CNMP Planner

NARRATIVE FOR C&H HOG FARMS
NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

This Nutrient Management Plan was developed for C&H Hog Farms. The farm located approximately 1.6 miles to the west of Mt. Judea AR. Driving directions from Mt. Judea is approximate 0.8 miles southwest on County Rd 54 and right on County rd 41 approximately 0.75 miles. The site is located on the left hand side of the road on a logging trail. The legal location is Section 26, Township 15 North, Range 20 West, Newton County, Arkansas. This Nutrient Management Plan was developed as a joint effort between C&H Hog Farms, the Natural Resources Conservation, and DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC.

The total available for crop uptake of N (18,497 lbs) and available P_2O_5 (14,213 lbs) produced annually by the livestock was determined by DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC using Arkansas Nutrient Management Planner with 2009 PI. The Storage Ponds have capacity of 3,112,473 gallons (this includes the shallow pits). The Storage Ponds have capacity at the Must Pumpdown Elevation of 2,145,227 gallons. The volume between the Freeboard and the Must Pumpdown Elevation is 207,705 gallons. Effluent from Waste Storage Pond 1 and 2 will be applied through a Vac Tanker. The effluent from Waste Storage Pond 2 may also be applied through a traveling gun and a permanent pipeline. The rate will be calculated in accordance to the crop needs using the Nutrient Management Planner with 2009 PI. The NMP includes 670.4 acres of agricultural land, most of which is available for manure application. After excluded acres the land available is approximately 630.7 acres. The typical crops grown are native grass (Bermudagrass and Fescue) either taken off as rotated pasture or hay. When calculating projected land base requirements and RUSLE 2 calculations, predicted crop yield goals was used. When calculating annual nutrient application needs, actual yields on a per field basis will be used.

The record keeping section is important for the proper application of nutrients from the facility. Records of commercial fertilizer will also be maintained. The facility will maintain the following documentation from each application of manure or wastewater: current soil sample analysis, current manure or wastewater analysis, records showing equipment calibration, a Water Quality Risk Assessment (WQRA) map showing actual area application, and a completed Arkansas Nutrient Management Planner summary showing calculated application rate.

NUTRIENT MANANGEMENT PLAN CONTACT INFORMATION

1. **Facility:**

NAME:	C&H Hog Farms
ADDRESS:	HC 72 Box 2 Vendor, AR 72683
PHONE NUMBER:	(870) 434-5004
EMAIL:	chhogfarmsinc@outlook.com
MANAGER:	Jason Henson

2. **Owners:**

NAME:	Jason Henson, Philip Campbell and Richard Campbell
ADDRESS:	HC 72 Box 2 Vendor, AR 72683
PHONE NUMBER:	(870) 434-5004

3. **NMP Developed by:** DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC

NAME:	Nathan A. Pesta
ADDRESS:	4200 21st St SE #101 Mandan, ND 58554
PHONE NUMBER:	(701) 663-1116
CELL NUMBER:	(701) 400-3950

4. **Legal Location of Facility**
Middle, Section 26, T-15-N, R-20-W, Newton County, AR

NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN INFORMATION

Type of Livestock:..... Swine
Number of head: 6503
Average Weight:.....153.6 lbs

Total Number of
*Acres Included in NMP after excluded acres:.....630.7 acres

*Note: these include acres for field's five and six which will not be used for land application since the location for field 5 is incorrect and the easement for field 6 is incorrect.

References

The nutrient management plan was developed based on compliance criteria described in the following documents:

☒ **Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission Regulation 6 dated** August 28th 2015

☒ **USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) conservation practice standard** *Nutrient Management ("590")* **dated** January 2015

☐ _____ **County zoning ordinance for animal feeding operations dated/amended**

Land Base

The nutrient management plan has sufficient land base to meet land application on a Nitrogen (N)-based for fields 5-9. Fields 1-4 and 10-17 are in addition and will be applied on a Phosphorus (P)-based manure application rate. P-based levels for spreading manure generally requires a significantly greater land base the N-based. When necessary, fields targeted for phosphorus-based manure application are identified in the **Manure Application Planning** section of this plan.

Local Zoning Ordinances

Operator Name: C&H Hog Farms County: Newton

The livestock operator is responsible for complying with all local ordinances. The operator shall address all of the following items and ensure any local requirements are met and/or included in this plan.

1. Does the county have any ordinances that require special permitting or approvals for siting animal feeding operations or land application of manure? ____ Yes _X_ No

   If yes, has the county permitted or approved this site? ____ Yes ____ No

   If no, do you intend to get approval or obtain local permits prior to land application of manure? ____ Yes ____ No

   Application of manure cannot occur until the operator obtains all local approvals.

2. Is the land application area, or any portion, located within the jurisdictional area of a city or town? ____ Yes _X_ No

   If yes, does the city or town have any special permitting for siting animal feeding operations or application of manure within their jurisdictional area? ____ Yes _X_ No

   If yes, has the city or town permitted or approved this site? ____ Yes ____ No

   If no, do you intend to get approval or obtain local permits prior to land application of manure? ____ Yes ____ No

   Application of manure cannot occur until the operator obtains local approval.

3. Are there specific setback distances that the county or city requires for application of manure? (For example, some local governments require specific setbacks from residences and public right-of-ways.) ____ Yes _X_ No

   If yes, show the applicable setbacks on the required field maps and exclude these areas from the total number of acres.

4. Is the land application site located in a wellhead protection area? ____ Yes _X_ No

   If yes, the producer needs to contact the local county, city or public water supply official to discuss specific requirements.

Jason Henson 4-5-18

(Operator Signature) (Date)

Section B: Nutrient Utilization Plan

B. NUTRIENT UTILIZATION PLAN

The Following is in this section:

1. Location
2. Record Keeping
3. Soil Sampling
4. Manure Sampling
5. Nutrient Budget for Land Application
6. Timing, Rate, and Frequency of Liquid and Solid Manure Applications
7. Land Application of Liquid Manure
8. Amounts of Nitrogen Applied
9. Solid Accumulation in the Retention Storage Pond
10. Check Valves/Safety Switches
11. Effluent/Solids Easement Agreement
12. Prevention of Destruction of Endangered or Threatened Species
13. Setback Requirements
14. Typical Crops Grown and Crop Yields for the Land Application Areas
15. Nutrient Utilization Plan Amendments

B. NUTRIENT UTILIZATION PLAN

1. **Location**
This plan is for C& H Hog Farms which is located in Newton County, Arkansas with a legal description of Section 26, Township 15 North, Range 20 West.

2. **Record Keeping.**
   a. A liquid manure pumping data sheet will be completed at the end of all pumping events by the person(s) responsible for monitoring the application event.

      The pumping data sheet will include calculations for rate, gallons applied, hours of application time, type of crop applied to, method of application and total acres to be applied.

   b. A solids manure application data sheet will be completed at the end of all land application events by the person(s) responsible for monitoring the application event.

      The application data sheet will include calculations for rate, cubic feet or tons applied, type of crop applied to, method of application and total acres to be applied.

   c. During Periods of Land Application, daily inspections shall be conducted and record the following
      1) Record the days each field is applied to, as well as weather conditions including; temperature, wind speed and wind direction.
      2) Inspect and record the condition of the land application fields being used.
      3) Inspect and record the condition of all land application equipment being used.
      4) Inspect and record the condition of the waste storage pond liner and embankment near the pump intake if pumping is taking place

   d. Inspections after Rainfall events shall be conducted and record the following:
      1) Record the depth of the water in all retention ponds.
      2) Inspect risers and pipe to ensure they are not plugged or damaged. Clean any significant sediment build up as soon as possible.
      3) Inspect storage ponds for signs of leaking or seepage, excessive settling, excessive vegetation growth or damage due to vehicles or equipment, rodents or erosion. Report any leakage as detailed above and make plans to rectify any problems.

4) Inspect fences and safety signs around the facility, if applicable, to ensure they are present and in good condition. If necessary repair immediately.
5) Record any livestock mortalities and how the carcasses were properly disposed of. (i.e. rendering service receipts, location of burial, etc.)

f. Annual inspections shall be conducted and record the following.

1) Conduct soil and manure testing as required by this plan.
2) Prepare an annual Nutrient Management Plan based on current data.
3) Annual reporting should be completed as referenced in http://www.adeq.state.ar.us/water/forms_inst.htm

3. **Soil Sampling.**

a. Composite base-line soil test samples for a new facility or a new land application area and land receiving liquid manure will be taken at least annually.

b. Soil samples will be taken before the land application of liquid and solids manure to determine the manure application rate appropriate to the land application area.

c. Samples will be taken as follows:

1) At least 20 cores taken to a depth of 24 inches shall be collected for each field.

a) One composite sample shall consist of the top six inches of no fewer than 20 combined. The other sample shall be the remaining six to 24 inches of at least 6-8 combined.

b) Phosphorus, copper and zinc shall be tested from the combined top six inches of the cores from a field.

c) Nitrate-N and chloride shall be tested from the combined six to 24 inches of the cores from a field.

d) The core composite portions of any sample, when mixed together, shall represent the field at the depths from the cores.
e) The soil samples shall be taken at least every 40 acres.

2) The samples will then be mixed in a plastic bucket (not metal) to form a representative composite sample for the field.

3) A subsample will be taken from the mixed composite and placed in the cloth bag provided by the analytical laboratory.

4) Soil samples for Nitrate-N and Phosphorus shall be taken no less than annually. The soil samples shall be certified by the person taking the samples as being a representative sample of the soil and of the nutrient values of the field being tested.

5) A copy of the certification of each composite soil sample and the laboratory results for each sample shall be maintained in the office of the facility and made available to the Department of Health or designee upon inspection. The certification will show the date the sample was taken, the approximate locations in the field from which the cores were taken, the depth or depths of the cores that constitutes the sample, the name of the person who took the sample and the date the sample delivered to a laboratory.

4. **Manure Sampling.**

a. Manure samples in conjunction with soil samples, will be taken prior to land application to determine land application rate.

b. Liquid and solid manure samples will be analyzed by a certified laboratory for pH, total dissolved salts, potassium, total nitrogen, ammonium-nitrogen and phosphorus.

5. **Nutrient Budget for Land Application.**

a. Nutrient loss due to volitization, evaporation, and crop uptake will be accounted for each time liquid manure is applied to the land application area.

b. In addition, communications with the farmer(s) will ensure proper planning of commercial fertilizer applications with liquid manure applications so that excess nutrients will not be applied to the land.

6. **Timing, Rate, and Frequency of Liquid and Solid Manure Applications.**

a. Liquid and solid manure will be applied at agronomic rates.

Weather conditions and nutrient holding capacity of the soil will determine the timing and rate of application.

b. Liquid and solid manure will not be applied to land classified as highly erodible according to the conservation compliance provisions of the Federal Food Security Act of 1985, saturated or frozen ground, or during a rainfall event.

Most land applications will be conducted in the spring, summer and fall.

c. Liquid manure will not be applied to land classified as highly erodible according to the conservation compliance provisions of the Federal Food Security Act of 1985, saturated or frozen ground, or during a rainfall event.

Most land applications will be conducted in the spring, summer and fall.

d. Land application will be conducted in a manner which will prevent a discharge or drainage of manure to ground or surface waters of the State.

e. Land application practices are managed so as to reduce or minimize ponding or puddling of liquid manure on the site, contamination of ground or surface waters, and occurrence of nuisance conditions such as odors, flies, and rodents.

f. Land application practices will minimize the possibility of contamination of surface and groundwaters of the State.

7. **Land Application of Liquid Manure**

a. Careful scheduling of the land application activities will reduce the threat of odor emissions to residents near the facility.

b. Days with low humidity are best for land application.

- Applications on holidays and weekends when people are most likely to be outdoors will be avoided when possible.

c. The use of sprinkler for land application will be one of the methods for liquid application. The use of a vactanker and equipment to knife inject or spread the nutrients on top the land for land application will be one of the methods for land application.

8. **Amounts of Nitrogen Applied.**

a. Liquid manure will typically be applied at agronomic rates for nitrogen, however, the phosphorus application will follow the Arkansas Nutrient Manangement Planner phosphorous index risk assessment to ensure that the phosphorus levels are not becoming a risk to surface water pollution.

b. Calculations for quantity of liquid manure that can be applied to agronomic rates to crop production land are performed by the staff soil scientist or or land application formulas prepared by University of Arkansas Extension.

c. Max. application (lbs/ac)/Manure N Content (lbs/ac-in) = Max. manure application (ac-in).

d. Acres for application x Max. manure application (ac-in) x 27154 = Max. pumping volume (gallons).

e. The spreadsheet log for land application can be utilized for land application calculations.

9. **Solid Accumulation in the Retention Storage Pond.**

a. The design and operation of the waste storage pond at the facility provides for desludging during each waste removal.

b. If or when pond desludging becomes necessary, Jason Henson- will land apply the solids at agronomic rates and in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.

c. Solids will be land farmed utilizing available technology at the time of application.

10. **Check Valves/Safety Switches**
- With the utilization of subsoil land application equipment, the use of check valves/safety switches are not necessary.

11. **Effluent/Solids Easement Agreement.**
Easements are found in Section G

12. **Prevention of Destruction of Endangered or Threatened Species.**

a. Animal manure handling, treatment and management plans are designed with the intention of reducing any harm or destruction of endangered or threatened species or contribute to the taking of any federally endangered or threatened species of plant, fish, or wildlife; nor interfere with or cause harm to migratory birds.
b. C&H Hog Farms will notify the appropriate fish and wildlife agency in the event of any significant fish, wildlife, or migratory bird/endangered species kill or die-off on or near a retention pond or in the field where waste has been applied and which could reasonably have resulted from waste management at the facility.

13. **Setback Requirements.**

a. Manure shall not be applied any closer than a 100 feet to any down-gradient surface waters, open tile line intake structures, sinkholes, agricultural well heads or other conduits to surface waters.
b. Incorporate surface applications of solid forms of manure or some commercial fertilizer nitrogen formulations (i.e. Urea) into the soil within 24 hours of application.
c. When applying liquid forms of manure with irrigation equipment select application conditions when there is high humidity, little/no wind blowing, a forth coming rainfall event, and or other conditions that will minimize volatilization losses into the atmosphere. The basis for applying manure under these conditions shall be documented in the nutrient management plans.

14. **Typical Crops Grown and Crop Yields for the Land Application Areas:**

a. Pasture – 6.5 tons/acre
b. Hay - 6.5 tons/acres

15. **Nutrient Utilization Plan Amendments.**

a. This plan may be amended when it fails to provide for protection of environmental resources or as appropriate.

b. This plan will also need to be amended with Arkansas DEQ approval when one of the following conditions exist:

1) Additional land to which waste will be applies is not described in the approved plans.

2) A procedure will be used that is not described in an approved plan.

3) Land described in an approved plan is no longer available for nutrient application.

Section C: Land Application Calculations

SECTION C. Land Application Calculations

The following Information is attached

1. Land Application and Manure Calculations
2. Yield Goal & Crop Nutrient Uptake
3. Phosphorus Index

10B.1. Land Application Calculations
Using 210-vi-AWMFH Chapter 11
C& H Hog Farms
1-Jun-12

1. Estimate the total nutrients (NPK) in the excreted manure.

Nutrients per storage period = # of animals x weight (lbs) x daily nutrient production (lb/day/1,000 lb) x storage period (days).

		# of Animals	Average Weight (lbs.)	Daily Nutrient Production (lb/day/1,000 lbs)	Storage Period	Total Nutrients
Nitrogen						
	Farrowing Sows	400	425	0.47	365	29,164
	Gestation Sows	2100	375	0.19	365	54,613
	Boars	3	450	0.15	365	74
	Nursery Pigs	4000	10	0.60	365	8,760
	Growing Gilts	0	150	0.42	365	0
Total Nitrogen		**6,503**				**92,611**
Phosphorus						
	Farrowing Sows	400	425	0.15	365	9,308
	Breeding/Gestation Sows	2100	375	0.063	365	18,109
	Boars	3	450	0.05	365	25
	Nursery Pigs	4000	10	0.25	365	3,650
	Finisher Pigs	0	150	0.16	365	0
Total Phosphorus		**6,503**				**31,091**
Potassium	Lactating Sows	400	425	0.3	365	18,615
	Breeding/Gestation Sows	2100	375	0.123	365	35,355
	Boars	3	450	0.10	365	49
	Nursery Pigs	4000	10	0.35	365	5,110
	Finisher Pigs	0	150	0.22	365	0
Total Potassium		**6,503**				**59,129**

2. Add nutrients contained in wastewater.

Nutrients in the wastewater = Number of animals x daily wastewater production (gal./day/pig) x daily nutrient production (lb. of nutrient/1,000 gal.) x no. of days.

		# of Animals	Daily Wastewater Production (gal./day/pig)	Daily Nutrient Production (lb/day/1,000 gal)	Storage Period	Total Nutrients
Nitrogen						
	Farrowing Sows	400	0	0	365	0
	Breeding/Gestation Sows	2100	0	0	365	0
	Boars	3	0	0	365	0
	Nursery Pigs	4000	0	0	365	0
	Finisher Pigs	0	0	0	365	0
Total Nitrogen		**6,503**				**0**
Phosphorus						
	Farrowing Sows	400	0	0	365	0
	Breeding/Gestation Sows	2100	0	0	365	0
	Boars	3	0	0	365	0
	Nursery Pigs	4000	0	0	365	0
	Finisher Pigs	0	0	0	365	0
Total Phosphorus		**6,503**				**0**
Potassium	Farrowing Sows	400	0	0	365	0
	Breeding/Gestation Sows	2100	0	0	365	0
	Boars	3	0	0	365	0
	Nursery Pigs	4000	0	0	365	0
	Finisher Pigs	0	0	0	365	0
Total Potassium		**6,503**				**0**

Total Nutrients Produced								
	Total N	92,611	lbs					
	Total P	31,091	lbs					
	Total K	59,129	lbs					
Convert to Fertilizer Form								
	Total N	92,611	lbs					
	Total P2O5	71,198	lbs					
	Total K2O	71,546	lbs					

3. Subtract nutrients lost during storage

Nutrients after storage losses = Total nutrients produced x fraction retained = Amount for land application

Solids (assume 0% of nutrients retained in solids)

Item	Nutrients (lbs)	Percent of Orig.	Available for Land Application (lbs)	Estimated Manure Test, lbs/ton, from Section 8
Total N	0	0.70	0	0.0
Total P2O5	0	0.80	0	0.0
Total K2O	0	0.80	0	0.0

Liquids (assume 100% of nutrients retained in liquids)(Table 11-5 Ag Waste Managnement Field Handbook, manure stored in pits beneath slatted floor)

Item	Nutrients (lbs)	Percent of Orig.	Available for Land	Estimating Nutrient Tests (lbs/1000 Gallons)(From Section 8)
Total N	92,611	0.73	67,606	56.6
Total P2O5	71,198	0.85	60,518	50.7
Total K2O	71,546	0.85	60,814	50.9

4. Determine the plant available nutrients

Estimate the amount of nutrients that will be available each year after the third consecutive year of application

Plant available nutrients = Amount applied x fraction available

Solids (assume 0% of nutrients retained in solids)

Item	Nutrients (lbs	Percent Avail.	Available for Land Application (lbs)
Total N	0	0.73	0
Total P2O5	0	0.90	0
Total K2O	0	0.93	0

Liquids (assume 100% of nutrients retained in liquids) (Swine manure stored in covered storage)

Item	Nutrients (lbs)	Percent Avail.	Available for Land Application (lbs)
Total N	67,606	0.73	49,352
Total P2O5	60,518	0.85	51,440
Total K2O	60,814	0.85	51,692

5. Determine the nutrients required by the crop and soil to produce the yield goal

5a (1). Estimate the amount of nutrients removed by the crop using table 6-6.

Using an average of Bermudagrass (3.25 tons/acre) x (2 cuttings)

Nutrient Uptake		
N	244.4	lbs/acre
P	24.7	lbs/acre
K	182	lbs/acre
Convert to Fertilizer Form		
N	244	lbs/acre
P2O5	57	lbs/acre
K2O	220	lbs/acre

5a (2). Add to the plant requirements additional nitrogen to replace anticipated denitrification losses					
	Assume 2% organic matter content & moderately well drained soil				
	N =	244.4	281	lbs/acre	
		0.87			
5a (3). Add to the plant requirements additional nitrogen to replace anticipated leaching losses					
	Assume a leaching index of 6 inches				
	N =	281	323	lbs/acre	
		0.87			
6. Add additional nitrogen to compensate for application losses					
	Solids				
	N =	323	538	lbs/acre	
		0.6			
	Liquids				
	N =	323	333	lbs/acre	
		0.97			
7. Compute the acres on which manure can be applied to use the nutrients available.					
Nitrogen Basis					
Required Solids Acres					
	Required acres =	0			
Required Liquid Acres					
	Required acres =	148			
Total Acres Nitrogen Base		**148**			
Phosphorus Basis (based off P_2O_5/acre uptake)					
Required Solids Acres					
	Required acres =	0			
Required Liquid Acres					
	Required acres =	909			
Total Acres Phosphorus Base		**909**			
8. Compute Estimated Application Rate					
Estimated Annual Solids Waste for App.		0	ft^3	0.0	tons
Estimated Annual Liquid Waste for App.		471,073	ft^3		
Nitrogen Basis					
Solids Application Rate			ft^3/acre =	0.0	tons/acre
Liquid Application Rate		3,177	ft^3/acre =	0.88	in./acre
Phosphorus Basis					
Solids Application Rate			ft^3/acre =	0.0	tons/acre
Liquid Application Rate		518	ft^3/acre =	0.14	in./acre

5 Year Crop Rotation & Yield Goal & Crop Nutrient Needs

Table 1. 5 Year Crop Rotation

Years	Fields	Commodity
One-Five	1, 2, & 4	Bermudagrass teamed with Tall Fescue, Rotational Pasture
One-Five	3 & 5-17	Bermudagrass teamed with Tall Fescue, Hay

Table 2. Plant Nutrient Uptake

				*% of the Dry Harvested Material			Nutrient Uptake, lb of nutrients		
County	State	Commodity	#Yield Goals (Tons)	N	P	K	N	P	K
Newton	Arkansas	#FORAGE, HAY (BERMUDAGRASS)	6.5	1.88	0.19	1.4	244.4	24.7	182
McHenry	Arkansas	#FORAGE, ROTATIONAL PASTURE (BERMUDAGRASS)	6.5	1.88	0.19	1.4	244.4	24.7	182

* From Table 6.6 of Part 651 Agricultural Waste Mangement Field Handbook

#U of A Cooperative Extension Service, yield goal for Northern Arkansas

Table 3. Convert Plant Nutrient Needs (N, P, K) to Fertilizer Form

	Hay	Pasture
N	244.4	244.4
P_2O_5	56.6	56.6
K_2O	220.2	220.2

SECTION C2: DESIGN CALCULATIONS

Waste Production Calculations

A. Facility Information

1. Type of Construction: ☒existing, ☐ proposed-new, or ☐ expansion

2. Building Area, **Barn 1 Gestation Barn** (Proposed): *421.3* feet by *117.5* feet
   Barn 2 Farrowing Barn (Proposed): *367.1* feet by *82.5* feet

3. Animal Capacity (maximum head counts and average weights)

3	head of *Boars*	@ *450*	lbs, *1,350*	lbs Total
2,100	head of *Gestation Sows*	@ *375*	lbs, *787,500*	lbs Total
400	head of *Lactating Sow*	@ *425*	lbs, *170,000*	lbs Total
4,000	head of *Nursery Pig*	@ *10*	lbs, *40,000*	lbs Total
	head of	@	lbs,	lbs Total

Total: ***6,503*** **head** **Total Animal Weight (TAW):** ***998,850*** **lbs**

B. Determine Minimum Storage Requirement

The Minimum Storage Requirement is the sum of the animal waste produced (or treatment volume for an anaerobic lagoon), plus the spillage and washwater, plus the pit recharge produced in 180 days. Generally, outside or contributing drainage area runoff is to be diverted. Runoff which is not diverted must be included in the storage requirement.

The following is completed for either Liquid Manure Storage or Anaerobic Lagoon

Liquid Manure Storage

Unit Waste Production (UWP) in cubic feet per day per 1,000 pounds of animal:

Cattle	Swine	Poultry	Other
❒Dairy = 1.3	☒ Nursery Pig = 1.4	❒ Layers = 0.9	❒ Horse = 0.8
❒ Beef = 1.0	❒ Grower/Finisher = 1.0	❒ Broiler = 1.3	❒ Sheep = 0.6
	☒ Boar/Gestating Sow = 0.41	❒ Turkey = 0.7	
	☒ Sow and Litter = 0.97		

(a) Manure produced: (TAW x (UWP x 180 days/1,000)) = *97,979* cubic feet / 1,000 lbs
(TAW x UWP for each type calculated separately and added to find total manure produced)

(b) Spillage and Washwater generated in 180 days: *19,596* cubic feet
(If unknown, 20% of (a) is used)

(c) Total Manure plus Spillage and Washwater, (a)+(b): *117,575* cubic feet.

Rainfall Data

(d) 25 Year- 24 Hour Rainfall Event: *0.58* Feet

(e) Precipitation-Evaporation October 1 – April 1) *0.92* *Feet*
(f) Top of Waste Storage Pond 1 *20,153* Square feet
(g) Top of Waste Storage Pond 2 *32,950* Square feet

(h) Waste Storage Pond 1 25 Yr-24 Hr Storage Requirement (d) x (f): *11,689* cubic feet
(i) Waste Storage Pond 2 25 Yr-24 Hr Storage Requirement (d) x (g): *19,111* cubic feet
(j) Waste Storage Pond 1, 180 Day Net Precip. Requirement (e) x (f): *18,541* cubic feet
(k) Waste Storage Pond 2, 180 Day Net Precip. Requirement (e) x (g): *30,314* cubic feet

Recharge Water -The farrowing barn will be pulled once every three weeks and the Gestation Barn will be pulled once every five weeks on a conservative estimate and will be recharged with 2" of fresh water .

(l) Recharge Water Produced Average: *366*(cubic feet per day) x *180* (180 days in storage period) = *65,880* cubic feet per 180 days.

Runoff

(m) Sand Lane and Stacking Pad Area:_____feet x _____feet = _____square feet

(n) Manure Stacking Pad Area:_____feet x _____feet = _____square feet

(o) Feed Stacking Pad Area:_____feet x _____feet = _____square feet

(p) Total Runoff Area:_____square feet

(q) Minimum Runoff (Figure 1 from Appendix):_____inches

NOTE: If a covered storage is used which collects runoff, then the sum of the 25 year, 24 hour storm runoff and the expected runoff for the 180 day storage period is used as the Minimum Runoff in (m).

(r) Minimum Runoff Storage Requirement (l) x (m)/12 = _____cubic feet

Minimum Overall Storage Requirement

(s) Minimum Storage Requirement (c) + (h-l) + (r): *263,110* cubic feet

Waste Storage Calculations

A. Determine Storage Provided

Type of storage: ☐ Earthen Storage Pit ☒ Earthen Lagoon ☐ Concrete Tank
☐ Underfloor Concrete Pit ☐ Outside Concrete Pit
☐ Other (describe) _____

NOTE: A scale drawing, calculations and other supporting information will be included. Indicate the location of all diversions, diversion dimensions, and flow directions of surface runoff for the entire facility. Concrete pit or tank storage is assumed to be covered unless specified otherwise.

Rectangular Concrete Pit or Tank (capacity = length x width x depth)

420.3 feet x *114.3* feet x *1.5* feet = *72,060* cubic feet (Manure Pit #1)
227.3 feet x *76.3* feet x *1.7* feet = *29,483* cubic feet (Manure Pit #2)

= ***101,543*** **cubic feet TOTAL**

Waste Storage Pond 1 Volume = [(4 x sideslope^2 x depth^3) / 3] + (sideslope x bottomlength x depth^2) + (sideslope x bottomwidth x depth^2) + (bottomwidth x bottomlength x depth)

Bottom Length: _____ Bottom Width: _____

Design Full Depth: *9.7* feet, Overflow Depth: *10.7* feet

Side Slopes: *3* :1 and *3* , End Slopes: *3* :1 and *3* :1

Note: Inside slopes for earthen pits or lagoons will be at least 2:1.

Earthen Storage Pit or Lagoon Capacity: *100,065* cubic feet

Waste Storage Pond 2 Volume = [(4 x sideslope^2 x depth^3) / 3] + (sideslope x bottomlength x depth^2) + (sideslope x bottomwidth x depth^2) + (bottomwidth x bottomlength x depth)

Bottom Length: _____ Bottom Width: _____

Design Full Depth: *12.2* feet, Overflow Depth: *13.2* feet

Side Slopes: *3* :1 and *3* , End Slopes: *3* :1 and *3* :1

Note: Inside slopes for earthen pits or lagoons will be at least 2:1.

Earthen Storage Pit or Lagoon Capacity: *214,498* cubic feet

NOTE: A minimum of 1.0 foot of freeboard is required for uncovered storage.

TOTAL STORAGE PROVIDED: ***416,106*** **cubic feet**

NOTE: The Total Storage Provided will meet or exceed the Minimum Storage Requirement (item o) from Waste Productions Calculation

2018 Pond 1

Maximum Split Application Rate Table – Read left to right across for each field.

			Maximum Application Rates in Gallons Per Acre and Gallons Per Field						Annual Maximums*		Yearly
			1st Timing Window Winter		2nd Timing Window Spring		3rd Timing Window Summer		1000 Gallons Acre	1000 Gallons Field	P Index
Field	Acres	Source	November 1 – February 28		March 1 – June 30		July 1 – October 31				
H1	7.3	HP 1			4,500/ac	32,850/field	4,000/ac	29,200/field	8.5	62.05	20
H2	6.0	HP 1			4,500/ac	27,000/field	4,000/ac	24,000/field	8.5	51.0	24
H3	13.6	HP 1			4,500/ac	61,200/field	4,000/ac	54,400/field	8.5	115.60	44
H4	6.8	HP 1			4,500/ac	30,600/field	4,000/ac	27,200/field	8.5	57.80	24
H7	64.3	HP 1			6,000/ac	385,800/field	6,000/ac	385,800/field	12.0	771.60	61
H8	8.6	HP 1			8,000/ac	68,800/field	8,000/ac	68,800/field	16.0	137.60	34
H9	35.5	HP 1			6,500/ac	230,750/field	6,500/ac	230,750/field	13.0	461.50	54
H10	29.3	HP 1			8,000/ac	234,400/field	8,000/ac	234,400/field	16.0	468.80	34
H11	14.2	HP 1			4,500/ac	63,900/field	4,000/ac	56,800/field	8.5	120.70	21
H12	11.4	HP 1			7,000/ac	79,800/field	7,000/ac	79,800/field	14.0	159.60	63
H13	50.9	HP 1			4,500/ac	229,050/field	4,500/ac	229,050/field	9.0	458.10	24
H14	8.1	HP 1			4,500/ac	36,450/field	4,500/ac	36,450/field	9.0	72.90	22
H15	37.5	HP 1			4,500/ac	168,750/field	4,000/ac	150,000/field	8.5	318.75	26
H16	15.2	HP 1			4,500/ac	68,400/field	4,000/ac	60,800/field	8.5	129.20	35
H17	31.9	HP 1			8,000/ac	255,200/field	8,000/ac	255,200/field	16.0	510.40	53

*Annual Maximums if applied during the appropriate timing windows.

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt Planner with 2009 PI (Beta draft ver 09162015)

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Application Rates

Date:	3/1/2018

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners working with Author. This worksheet is intended to assist in the writing of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of manure to pasture and hay land. To do this, the worksheet estimates the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Index risk value for the defined conditions of each field, assists with the allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, and estimates the amount of litter available for off farm use. This worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliable training/planning tool faithful to the 2009 Arkansas P Index developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guarantees are made, and any observed problems or suggestions for improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevender at kvan@uaex.edu.

Nutrient Source and Description Information

Manure Source	Source Type	Amount Available		N Concentration		P2O5 Concentration		K2O Concentration		Water Extractable P		Alum
HP 1 Feb 2018	Liquid Manure	1	1000 gal	21.6	lb/1000 gal	28.3	lb/1000 gal	17.6	lb/1000 gal	1.20	lb/1000 gal	No
HP 2 Feb 2018	Liquid Manure	1	1000 gal	8.3	lb/1000 gal	2.6	lb/1000 gal	15.2	lb/1000 gal	0.70	lb/1000 gal	No

Nutrient Loss and Mineralization Factors

Manure Source	N		P2O5		K2O	
	Storage Losses (%)	Appl. Losses (%)	Storage Losses (%)	Appl. Losses (%)	Storage Losses (%)	Appl. Losses (%)
HP 1 Feb 2018		25%				
HP 2 Feb 2018		25%				
0						
0						
0						

Estimated Plant Available Nutrients

Manure Source	N			P2O5			K2O			Water Extractable P		
	Concentration		Total (lb)	Concentration		Total (lb)	Concentration		Total (lb)	Concentration		Total (lb)
HP 1 Feb 2018	16.20	lb/1000 gal	16	28.30	lb/1000 gal	28	17.60	lb/1000 gal	18	1.20	lb/1000 gal	1.2
HP 2 Feb 2018	6.23	lb/1000 gal	6	2.60	lb/1000 gal	3	15.20	lb/1000 gal	15	0.70	lb/1000 gal	0.7
0												
0												
0												
			22			31			33			2

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt Planner with 2009 PI (Beta draft 11202017)

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application Rates 3/1/2018

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners working with Author. This worksheet is intended to assist in the writing of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of manure to pasture and hay land. To do this, the worksheet estimates the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Index risk value for the defined conditions of each field, assists with the allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, and estimates the amount of litter available for off farm use. This worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliable training/planning tool faithful to the 2009 Arkansas P Index developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guarantees are made, and any observed problems or suggestions for improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevender at kvandevender@uaex.edu. *This version contains the Nov 2017 NRCS soils update.*

Fields Shown		15	- - - General Field Information - - - - - -						Slope Gradient (%)				Slope Length (ft)			
Total Annual		Field	County	Field Area (ac)	Buffer Length (ft)	Buffer Width (ft)	Appl Area (ac)	Soil Map Unit	Min	Max	Rep	Used	Min	Max	Rep	Used
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)	Newton													
20	-22	H1	Newton	15.60			15.60	42	3	8	5	5	15	75	45	45
24	-22	H2	Newton	17.00			17.00	43	8	20	14	14	15	30	20	20
44	-22	H3	Newton	13.60			13.60	48	0	3	2	2	15	75	45	45
24	-22	H4	Newton	8.80			8.80	43	8	20	14	14	15	30	20	20
61	-106	H7	Newton	74.30			74.30	48	0	3	2	2	15	75	45	45
34	-41	H8	Newton	15.50			15.50	51	2	5	2.5	2.5	15	75	45	45
54	-89	H9	Newton	41.20			41.20	50	0	3	2	2	15	75	45	45
34	-41	H10	Newton	33.20			33.20	51	2	5	2.5	2.5	15	75	45	45
21	-22	H11	Newton	20.70			20.70	43	8	20	14	14	15	30	20	20
63	-73	H12	Newton	23.70			23.70	50	0	3	2	2	15	75	45	45
24	-154	H13	Newton	61.60			61.60	43	8	20	14	14	15	30	20	20
22	-154	H14	Newton	18.00			18.00	43	8	20	14	14	15	30	20	20
26	-22	H15	Newton	61.00			61.00	43	8	20	14	14	15	30	20	20
35	-22	H16	Newton	79.60			79.60	50	0	3	2	2	15	75	45	45
53	-41	H17	Newton	88.70			88.70	1	3	8	5	5	15	75	45	45
Farm Totals				572.50			572.50									
Available Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)																

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Fields Shown		15	rmation - - - - - - General Field Information - - - - - - General Field Information - - - - - - General Field Information - - -										A
Total Annual			Flooding Frequency		Predominate Vegetation	Percent Ground Cover	Conservation Support Practices (P)	Pasture Use	RUSLE 1 (ton/ac)	RUSLE 2 (ton/ac)	Diversion	Terrace	Pond
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	Field	Data Base Default	Used									
		(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)											
20	-22	H1	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.12	0.12			
24	-22	H2	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.26	0.28			
44	-22	H3	Occasional	Occasional	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.05	0.05			
24	-22	H4	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.26	0.28			
61	-106	H7	Occasional	Occasional	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.05	0.05			
34	-41	H8	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.05	0.05			
54	-89	H9	Occasional	Occasional	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.05	0.05			
34	-41	H10	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.05	0.05			
21	-22	H11	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.26	0.28			
63	-73	H12	Occasional	Occasional	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.05	0.05			
24	-154	H13	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.26	0.28			
22	-154	H14	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.26	0.28			
26	-22	H15	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.26	0.28			
35	-22	H16	Occasional	Occasional	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.05	0.05			
53	-41	H17	None	None	Grass	95-100	None	Rotational Grazing	0.12	0.12			

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application I

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Fields Shown		15	dditional Best Management Practices						- - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient Appl							
Total Annual		Field	Filter Strip	Grassed Waterway	Fencing	Riparian Forest Buffer	Riparian Herbaceous Cover	Field Borders	- - - Application Group 1 - - -	- - - Application Group 1 - - -	- - - Application Group 1 - - -			N	P2O5	K2O
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)								Timing	Appl Method	Nutrient Source	Bulk Rate	Units	(lb/ac)	(lb/ac)	(lb/ac)
		(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018					
20	-22	H1							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
24	-22	H2							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
44	-22	H3							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
24	-22	H4							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
61	-106	H7							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	6.00	1000 gal/ac	97	170	106
34	-41	H8							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	8.00	1000 gal/ac	130	226	141
54	-89	H9							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	6.50	1000 gal/ac	105	184	114
34	-41	H10							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	8.00	1000 gal/ac	130	226	141
21	-22	H11							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
63	-73	H12							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	7.00	1000 gal/ac	113	198	123
24	-154	H13							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
22	-154	H14							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
26	-22	H15							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
35	-22	H16							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79
53	-41	H17							March-June	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	8.00	1000 gal/ac	130	226	141

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application I

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Fields Shown		15	lication Information - - - - - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient														
					- - - Application Group 2 - - -											- - - Application Group	
Total Annual		Field	Group Sub PI	Group Sub PI Range	Timing	Appl Method	Nutrient Source	Bulk Rate	Units	N (lb/ac)	P2O5 (lb/ac)	K2O (lb/ac)	Group Sub PI	Group Sub PI Range	Timing	Appl Method
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)			July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018									
20	-22	H1	8	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.00	1000 gal/ac	65	113	70	5	Low		
24	-22	H2	9	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.00	1000 gal/ac	65	113	70	6	Low		
44	-22	H3	15	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.00	1000 gal/ac	65	113	70	12	Low		
24	-22	H4	9	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.00	1000 gal/ac	65	113	70	6	Low		
61	-106	H7	20	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	6.00	1000 gal/ac	97	170	106	17	Low		
34	-41	H8	15	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	8.00	1000 gal/ac	130	226	141	11	Low		
54	-89	H9	22	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	6.50	1000 gal/ac	105	184	114	19	Low		
34	-41	H10	15	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	8.00	1000 gal/ac	130	226	141	11	Low		
21	-22	H11	9	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.00	1000 gal/ac	65	113	70	6	Low		
63	-73	H12	23	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	7.00	1000 gal/ac	113	198	123	20	Low		
24	-154	H13	9	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79	7	Low		
22	-154	H14	9	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.50	1000 gal/ac	73	127	79	7	Low		
26	-22	H15	9	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.00	1000 gal/ac	65	113	70	6	Low		
35	-22	H16	15	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	4.00	1000 gal/ac	65	113	70	12	Low		
53	-41	H17	23	Low	July-Oct	Surface	HP 1 Feb 2018	8.00	1000 gal/ac	130	226	141	19	Low		

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Fields Shown		15	Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient Application Information - - - - - - Nutrient App													
			3 - - - - - - Application Group 3 - - - - - - Application Group 3 - - -								- - - Application Group 4 - - - - - - Application Group 4 - - - - - - Applicatio					
Total Annual		Field	Nutrient Source	Bulk Rate	Units	N	P2O5	K2O	Group Sub PI	Group Sub PI Range	Timing	Appl Method	Nutrient Source	Bulk Rate	Units	N
						(lb/ac)	(lb/ac)	(lb/ac)								(lb/ac)
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)														
20	-22	H1														
24	-22	H2														
44	-22	H3														
24	-22	H4														
61	-106	H7														
34	-41	H8														
54	-89	H9														
34	-41	H10														
21	-22	H11														
63	-73	H12														
24	-154	H13														
22	-154	H14														
26	-22	H15														
35	-22	H16														
53	-41	H17														

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Fields Shown		15	ication Information - - -				Soil Test P and Soil Sub PI				Application Totals		Total = Soil + Applications		Application Rate To	
Total Annual		Field	n Group 4 - - - P2O5 (lb/ac)	K2O (lb/ac)	Group Sub PI	Group Sub PI Range	ppm	lb/ac	Soil Sub PI	Soil Sub Range	App Sub PIs Sum	App Sub PIs Range	Total PI Value	PI Range	N (lb/ac)	P2O5 (lb/ac)
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)														
20	-22	H1					87	116	7	Low	13	Low	20	Low	138	241
24	-22	H2					104	138	9	Low	15	Low	24	Low	138	241
44	-22	H3					118	157	17	Low	27	Low	44	Medium	138	241
24	-22	H4					109	145	9	Low	15	Low	24	Low	138	241
61	-106	H7					165	219	24	Low	37	Medium	61	Medium	194	340
34	-41	H8					101	134	8	Low	26	Low	34	Medium	259	453
54	-89	H9					89	118	13	Low	41	Medium	54	Medium	211	368
34	-41	H10					100	133	8	Low	26	Low	34	Medium	259	453
21	-22	H11					65	86	6	Low	15	Low	21	Low	138	241
63	-73	H12					138	184	20	Low	43	Medium	63	Medium	227	396
24	-154	H13					88	117	8	Low	16	Low	24	Low	146	255
22	-154	H14					65	86	6	Low	16	Low	22	Low	146	255
26	-22	H15					132	176	11	Low	15	Low	26	Low	138	241
35	-22	H16					58	77	8	Low	27	Low	35	Medium	138	241
53	-41	H17					87	116	11	Low	42	Medium	53	Medium	259	453

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Fields Shown		15	Per Acre Nutrient Budget							--- Per Field Nutrient Budget - - - - - - Per Field		
		tals	Nutrient Recommendation			Surpluses / Deficits (+/-)			Application Rate Totals		
Total Annual		Field	K2O (lb/ac)	N (lb/ac)	P2O5 (lb/ac)	K2O (lb/ac)	N (lb/ac)	P2O5 (lb/ac)	K2O (lb/ac)	N (lb/field)	P2O5 (lb/field)	K2O (lb/field)
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)										
20	-22	H1	150	160	0	0	-22	241	150	2,148	3,753	2,334
24	-22	H2	150	160	0	0	-22	241	150	2,341	4,089	2,543
44	-22	H3	150	160	0	60	-22	241	90	1,873	3,271	2,035
24	-22	H4	150	160	0	40	-22	241	110	1,212	2,117	1,316
61	-106	H7	211	300	0	300	-106	340	-89	14,444	25,232	15,692
34	-41	H8	282	300	0	300	-41	453	-18	4,018	7,018	4,365
54	-89	H9	229	300	0	250	-89	368	-21	8,677	15,157	9,427
34	-41	H10	282	300	0	250	-41	453	32	8,605	15,033	9,349
21	-22	H11	150	160	0	0	-22	241	150	2,850	4,979	3,097
63	-73	H12	246	300	0	0	-73	396	246	5,375	9,390	5,840
24	-154	H13	158	300	0	200	-154	255	-42	8,981	15,690	9,757
22	-154	H14	158	300	0	250	-154	255	-92	2,624	4,585	2,851
26	-22	H15	150	160	0	0	-22	241	150	8,400	14,674	9,126
35	-22	H16	150	160	0	40	-22	241	110	10,961	19,148	11,908
53	-41	H17	282	300	0	300	-41	453	-18	22,991	40,163	24,978
Farm Totals										105,500	184,300	114,617
Available										22	31	33
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)										-105,478	-184,269	-114,585

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application I

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

- - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl T

Fields Shown		15	Nutrient Budget - - - - - - Per Field Nutrient Budget - - - - - - Per Field Nutrient Budget - - -									
			Nutrient Recommendation (lb/field)			Surpluses / Deficits (+/-)			March-June			
Total Annual		Field	N (lb/field)	P2O5 (lb/field)	K2O (lb/field)	N (lb/field)	P2O5 (lb/field)	K2O (lb/field)	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)										
20	-22	H1	2,496	0	0	-348	3,753	2,334	4.50	70.20	8	4.00
24	-22	H2	2,720	0	0	-379	4,089	2,543	4.50	76.50	9	4.00
44	-22	H3	2,176	0	816	-303	3,271	1,219	4.50	61.20	15	4.00
24	-22	H4	1,408	0	352	-196	2,117	964	4.50	39.60	9	4.00
61	-106	H7	22,290	0	22,290	-7,846	25,232	-6,598	6.00	445.80	20	6.00
34	-41	H8	4,650	0	4,650	-632	7,018	-285	8.00	124.00	15	8.00
54	-89	H9	12,360	0	10,300	-3,683	15,157	-873	6.50	267.80	22	6.50
34	-41	H10	9,960	0	8,300	-1,355	15,033	1,049	8.00	265.60	15	8.00
21	-22	H11	3,312	0	0	-462	4,979	3,097	4.50	93.15	9	4.00
63	-73	H12	7,110	0	0	-1,735	9,390	5,840	7.00	165.90	23	7.00
24	-154	H13	18,480	0	12,320	-9,499	15,690	-2,563	4.50	277.20	9	4.50
22	-154	H14	5,400	0	4,500	-2,776	4,585	-1,649	4.50	81.00	9	4.50
26	-22	H15	9,760	0	0	-1,360	14,674	9,126	4.50	274.50	9	4.00
35	-22	H16	12,736	0	3,184	-1,775	19,148	8,724	4.50	358.20	15	4.00
53	-41	H17	26,610	0	26,610	-3,619	40,163	-1,632	8.00	709.60	23	8.00
Farm Totals			141,468	0	93,322	-35,968	184,300	21,295		3310.25		
Available Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)												

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application I

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

ime, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time

HP 1 Feb 2018

Fields Shown		15	1000 gal									
			July-Oct		Nov-Feb			Annual			March-June	
Total Annual		Field	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)										
20	-22	H1	62.40	5				8.50	132.60	13.00		
24	-22	H2	68.00	6				8.50	144.50	15.00		
44	-22	H3	54.40	12				8.50	115.60	27.00		
24	-22	H4	35.20	6				8.50	74.80	15.00		
61	-106	H7	445.80	17				12.00	891.60	37.00		
34	-41	H8	124.00	11				16.00	248.00	26.00		
54	-89	H9	267.80	19				13.00	535.60	41.00		
34	-41	H10	265.60	11				16.00	531.20	26.00		
21	-22	H11	82.80	6				8.50	175.95	15.00		
63	-73	H12	165.90	20				14.00	331.80	43.00		
24	-154	H13	277.20	7				9.00	554.40	16.00		
22	-154	H14	81.00	7				9.00	162.00	16.00		
26	-22	H15	244.00	6				8.50	518.50	15.00		
35	-22	H16	318.40	12				8.50	676.60	27.00		
53	-41	H17	709.60	19				16.00	1419.20	42.00		
Farm Totals			3202.10						6512.35			
Available												
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)												

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Fie

HP 2 Feb 2018

1000 gal

Fields Shown		15		July-Oct			Nov-Feb			Annual		
Total Annual		Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)										
20	-22	H1										
24	-22	H2										
44	-22	H3										
24	-22	H4										
61	-106	H7										
34	-41	H8										
54	-89	H9										
34	-41	H10										
21	-22	H11										
63	-73	H12										
24	-154	H13										
22	-154	H14										
26	-22	H15										
35	-22	H16										
53	-41	H17										

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

ld - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field -

Sources

Fields Shown		15	March-June			July-Oct			Nov-Feb			
Total Annual		Field	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl Pl	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl Pl	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl Pl	Per Acre
Pl Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)										
20	-22	H1										
24	-22	H2										
44	-22	H3										
24	-22	H4										
61	-106	H7										
34	-41	H8										
54	-89	H9										
34	-41	H10										
21	-22	H11										
63	-73	H12										
24	-154	H13										
22	-154	H14										
26	-22	H15										
35	-22	H16										
53	-41	H17										

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

----- Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field ------ Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field ----

Fields Shown		15	Annual		March-June			July-Oct			Nov-Feb	
Total Annual		Field	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)										
20	-22	H1										
24	-22	H2										
44	-22	H3										
24	-22	H4										
61	-106	H7										
34	-41	H8										
54	-89	H9										
34	-41	H10										
21	-22	H11										
63	-73	H12										
24	-154	H13										
22	-154	H14										
26	-22	H15										
35	-22	H16										
53	-41	H17										

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

- - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field - - - - - -

Fields Shown		15		Annual			March-June			July-Oct		
Total Annual		Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)										
20	-22	H1										
24	-22	H2										
44	-22	H3										
24	-22	H4										
61	-106	H7										
34	-41	H8										
54	-89	H9										
34	-41	H10										
21	-22	H11										
63	-73	H12										
24	-154	H13										
22	-154	H14										
26	-22	H15										
35	-22	H16										
53	-41	H17										

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application I

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Source, Appl Time, Field - - - - - - Manu

Fields Shown		15	Nov-Feb			Annual			Annual Appl Totals: Dry (ton)			Annual Appl Totals: Liquid (1000 gal)		
Total Annual		Field	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)												
20	-22	H1										8.50	132.60	13
24	-22	H2										8.50	144.50	15
44	-22	H3										8.50	115.60	27
24	-22	H4										8.50	74.80	15
61	-106	H7										12.00	891.60	37
34	-41	H8										16.00	248.00	26
54	-89	H9										13.00	535.60	41
34	-41	H10										16.00	531.20	26
21	-22	H11										8.50	175.95	15
63	-73	H12										14.00	331.80	43
24	-154	H13										9.00	554.40	16
22	-154	H14										9.00	162.00	16
26	-22	H15										8.50	518.50	15
35	-22	H16										8.50	676.60	27
53	-41	H17										16.00	1419.20	42
													6512.35	

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

				Annual				- - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - -						
								Application Time						
Fields Shown		15	Total	Soil only PI			Annual Total PI = Soil + Applications		HP 1 Feb 2018			HP 2 Feb 2018		
									1000 gal			1000 gal		
Total Annual		Field	Appl PI	Assoc. Appl Time	P I Value	PI Range	Total PI Value	PI Range	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)													
20	-22	H1	13	March-June	7	Low	20	Low							
24	-22	H2	15	March-June	9	Low	24	Low							
44	-22	H3	27	March-June	17	Low	44	Medium							
24	-22	H4	15	March-June	9	Low	24	Low							
61	-106	H7	37	March-June	24	Low	61	Medium							
34	-41	H8	26	March-June	8	Low	34	Medium							
54	-89	H9	41	March-June	13	Low	54	Medium							
34	-41	H10	26	March-June	8	Low	34	Medium							
21	-22	H11	15	March-June	6	Low	21	Low							
63	-73	H12	43	March-June	20	Low	63	Medium							
24	-154	H13	16	March-June	8	Low	24	Low							
22	-154	H14	16	March-June	6	Low	22	Low							
26	-22	H15	15	March-June	11	Low	26	Low							
35	-22	H16	27	March-June	8	Low	35	Medium							
53	-41	H17	42	March-June	11	Low	53	Medium							

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevendei
NRCS soils update.

- Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manu

Nov-Feb

Fields Shown		15								All Sources					
										ton			1000 gal		
Total Annual		Field	Per Field	Appl Pl	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl Pl	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl Pl	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl Pl	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl Pl
Pl Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)														
20	-22	H1														
24	-22	H2														
44	-22	H3														
24	-22	H4														
61	-106	H7														
34	-41	H8														
54	-89	H9														
34	-41	H10														
21	-22	H11														
63	-73	H12														
24	-154	H13														
22	-154	H14														
26	-22	H15														
35	-22	H16														
53	-41	H17														

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application I

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

re Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Dis

March-June

Fields Shown		15		HP 1 Feb 2018			HP 2 Feb 2018									
Total Annual			Total	1000 gal			1000 gal									
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre
		(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)														
20	-22	H1		4.50	70.20	8										
24	-22	H2		4.50	76.50	9										
44	-22	H3		4.50	61.20	15										
24	-22	H4		4.50	39.60	9										
61	-106	H7		6.00	445.80	20										
34	-41	H8		8.00	124.00	15										
54	-89	H9		6.50	267.80	22										
34	-41	H10		8.00	265.60	15										
21	-22	H11		4.50	93.15	9										
63	-73	H12		7.00	165.90	23										
24	-154	H13		4.50	277.20	9										
22	-154	H14		4.50	81.00	9										
26	-22	H15		4.50	274.50	9										
35	-22	H16		4.50	358.20	15										
53	-41	H17		8.00	709.60	23										
Farm Totals					3310.25											
Available																
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)																

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application I

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

tribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distributic

Fields Shown		15			All Sources							HP 1 Feb 2018			HP 2 Feb 20	
					ton			1000 gal			Total	1000 gal			1000 gal	
Total Annual		Field	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)														
20	-22	H1						4.50	70.20	8	8	4.00	62.40	5		
24	-22	H2						4.50	76.50	9	9	4.00	68.00	6		
44	-22	H3						4.50	61.20	15	15	4.00	54.40	12		
24	-22	H4						4.50	39.60	9	9	4.00	35.20	6		
61	-106	H7						6.00	445.80	20	20	6.00	445.80	17		
34	-41	H8						8.00	124.00	15	15	8.00	124.00	11		
54	-89	H9						6.50	267.80	22	22	6.50	267.80	19		
34	-41	H10						8.00	265.60	15	15	8.00	265.60	11		
21	-22	H11						4.50	93.15	9	9	4.00	82.80	6		
63	-73	H12						7.00	165.90	23	23	7.00	165.90	20		
24	-154	H13						4.50	277.20	9	9	4.50	277.20	7		
22	-154	H14						4.50	81.00	9	9	4.50	81.00	7		
26	-22	H15						4.50	274.50	9	9	4.00	244.00	6		
35	-22	H16						4.50	358.20	15	15	4.00	318.40	12		
53	-41	H17						8.00	709.60	23	23	8.00	709.60	19		
Farm Totals									3310.25				3202.10			
Available																
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)																

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

ın Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Sun

July-Oct

Fields Shown		15	18													All Sources
													ton			
Total Annual		Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)														
20	-22	H1														4.00
24	-22	H2														4.00
44	-22	H3														4.00
24	-22	H4														4.00
61	-106	H7														6.00
34	-41	H8														8.00
54	-89	H9														6.50
34	-41	H10														8.00
21	-22	H11														4.00
63	-73	H12														7.00
24	-154	H13														4.50
22	-154	H14														4.50
26	-22	H15														4.00
35	-22	H16														4.00
53	-41	H17														8.00

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)

Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

mary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary,

					Annual										
Fields Shown		15	1000 gal		Total	HP 1 Feb 2018 1000 gal			HP 2 Feb 2018 1000 gal						
Total Annual		Field	Per Field	Appl PI	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)														
20	-22	H1	62.40	5	5	8.50	132.60	13.00								
24	-22	H2	68.00	6	6	8.50	144.50	15.00								
44	-22	H3	54.40	12	12	8.50	115.60	27.00								
24	-22	H4	35.20	6	6	8.50	74.80	15.00								
61	-106	H7	445.80	17	17	12.00	891.60	37.00								
34	-41	H8	124.00	11	11	16.00	248.00	26.00								
54	-89	H9	267.80	19	19	13.00	535.60	41.00								
34	-41	H10	265.60	11	11	16.00	531.20	26.00								
21	-22	H11	82.80	6	6	8.50	175.95	15.00								
63	-73	H12	165.90	20	20	14.00	331.80	43.00								
24	-154	H13	277.20	7	7	9.00	554.40	16.00								
22	-154	H14	81.00	7	7	9.00	162.00	16.00								
26	-22	H15	244.00	6	6	8.50	518.50	15.00								
35	-22	H16	318.40	12	12	8.50	676.60	27.00								
53	-41	H17	709.60	19	19	16.00	1419.20	42.00								
Farm Totals			3202.10				6512.35									
Available																
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)																

Section D: Phosphorous Based Field List

Section D. Fields Targeted for Phosphorus Based Manure Management

Operator Name C&H Hog Farms Date 04/05/2018

Based on current soil test results, there are no fields at this time that are identified as having high and/or very high soil phosphorus (P) levels. Refer to the previous page, including Table 1, for manure management guidelines to avoid further or unnecessary phosphorus buildup. Other management options are also available for consideration.

Sprdsht. Line	Field ID 1/ (Tract & Field)	Legal Description			Acres Available	Soil Phosphorus Test 2/		Date Tested
		Section	Twp.	Range		Mehlich 3 (PPM)		

1/ Place an asterisk (*) next to fields not owned by operator.

2/ An increase or decrease in phosphorus levels should be monitored with future soil tests to determine any needed manure application rate adjustments.

Section E: Inventory of Water Wells

Inventory of Water Wells

Field ID	Location (Legal)	Well Depth (Ft.)	Use of Well 1/	Required Setback Distance From Well For Manure Application (Ft.)	
				Distance From Field	State Rule
4	SW/4 of, Sec 25, T 15N, R 20 W	846	Private	NA	100
10	SE/4 of, Sec 35 T 15 N, R 20 W	700	Private	NA	100
14	SW/4, Sec 35, T 15 N, R 20 W	1035	Private	NA	100
7	E 1/2, Sec 26, T 15 N, R 20 W	325	Private	1,200	100
	E 1/2,	665			

1/ Well Use Categories:

- Producer (Owned)
- Private
- Public
- Irrigation

Section F: Land Treatment Information and Land Application Maps

SECTION F. Land Treatment Information and Land Application Maps

The following Information is attached

1. Waste Utilization Summary Spreadsheet
2. Overall Site Map
3. WQRA Maps
4. Soil Survey Maps

F.1 Waste Utilization Summary Spreadsheet

Field ID	Acreage	Setbacks	Useable		Quarter	Section	Township	Range	County	Owner of Land
Area			Acreage	Land						
	(Acres)	(Acres)	(Acres)	Use						
1	19.7	4.1	15.6	Grassland	SW 1/4	25	15N	20W	Newton	Jason Henson
2	19.3	2.3	17.0	Grassland	SW 1/4	25	15N	20W	Newton	Jason Henson
3	15.9	2.3	13.6	Grassland	SW 1/4	25	15N	20W	Newton	Charles Campbell
4	10.4	1.6	8.8	Grassland	NW 1/4	36	15N	20W	Newton	Jason Henson
5	24.9	1.2	23.8	Grassland	NE 1/4	26	15N	20W	Newton	Sean Crickets/Rickets
6	36.6	2.1	34.5	Grassland	NE1/4	26	15N	20W	Newton	William Rickets/Crickets
7	79.8	5.5	74.3	Grassland	E 1/2	26	15N	20W	Newton	E.G. Campbell
8	15.5	0.0	15.5	Grassland	NE 1/4	35	15N	20W	Newton	Charles Campbell
9	45.1	3.9	41.2	Grassland	NE 1/4	35	15N	20W	Newton	Charles Campbell
10	34.3	1.2	33.2	Grassland	NE 1/4	35	15N	20W	Newton	Billy Cheatham
11	20.7	0.0	20.7	Grassland	N 1/2	35	15N	20W	Newton	Billy Cheatham
12	28.7	5.1	23.7	Grassland	SE 1/4	35	15N	20W	Newton	Robby Flud
13	66.9	5.3	61.6	Grassland	S 1/2 & N 1/2	35&2	15N&14N	20W	Newton	Charles Campbell
14	18.0	0.0	18.0	Grassland	SW1/4	35	15N	20W	Newton	Charles Campbell
15	66.3	5.3	61.0	Grassland	NW 1/4	2	14N	20W	Newton	Clayel Criner
16	79.6	0.0	79.6	Grassland	All &SE 1/4	2&3	15N&14N	20W	Newton	Barbara Hefley
17	88.7	0.0	88.7	Grassland	NE 1/4&S 1/2	3&34	15N&14N	20W	Newton	Jason Criner
Total	670.4	39.7	630.7							

Topographic

Customer(s): JASON HENSON

Approximate Acres: 685



Legend

- Henson
- Buffer_Output5.shp
- Resource Inventory (Line)
- Buffer_Output.shp
- Resource Inventory (Polygon)
- Resource Inventory (Line)

1,250 0 1,250 2,500 3,750 5,000 Feet

N

Conservation Map

Customer(s): JASON HENSON

Approximate Acres: 685



Legend

- Henson
- Buffer_Output5.shp
- Resource Inventory (Line)
- Buffer_Output.shp
- Resource Inventory (Polygon)
- Resource Inventory (Line)

1,200 0 1,200 2,400 3,600 4,800
Feet

N



LEGEND

2 Arkana–Moko complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
3 Arkana–Moko complex, 20 to 40 percent slopes
6 Ceda–Kenn complex, frequently flooded
7 Clarksville very cherty silt loam, 20 to 50 percent slopes
8 Eden–Newnata complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
9 Eden–Newnata complex, 20 to 40 percent slopes
15 Enders–Leesburg stony loams, 8 to 20 percent slopes
16 Enders–Leesburg stony loams, 20 to 40 percent slopes
26 Moko–Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 50 percent slopes
37 Nella–Steprock complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
38 Nella–Steprock–Mountainburg very stony loams, 20 to 40 percent slopes
39 Nella–Steprock–Mountainburg very stony loams, 40 to 60 percent slopes
42 Noark very cherty silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
43 Noark very cherty silt loam, 8 to 20 percent slopes
44 Noark very cherty silt loam, 20 to 40 percent slopes
48 Razort loam, occasionally flooded
50 Spadra loam, occasionally flooded
51 Spadra loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes
54 Water

GENERAL NOTES

N

SCALE, FEET
0 250 500 750 1,000

No.	Revision/Issue	Date

DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC
Consulting Engineers
PO Box 522, Mandan, ND 58554
(701) 663-1116, FAX: (701) 667-1356
www.dgaengineering.com

C&H HOG FARMS
GESTATION-FARROWING FARM

SECTION 25 AND 36, T 15 N, R 20 W
NEWTON COUNTY, AR

FIELDS 1-4

DATE: MAY 29, 2012	SHEET: 1
SCALE: 1" = 500'	
DRAWN BY: NAP	
CHECKED BY: DLD	

FILE NAME: 05 PROJECT FILES/SWINE/HENSON/DFILES/PLAN



LEGEND

3 Arkana–Moko complex, 20 to 40 percent slopes
6 Ceda–Kenn complex, frequently flooded
11 Enders gravelly loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
13 Enders stony loam, 3 to 20 percent slopes
26 Moko–Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 50 percent slopes
35 Nella–Enders stony loams, 8 to 20 percent slopes
42 Noark very cherty silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
43 Noark very cherty silt loam, 8 to 20 percent slopes
44 Noark very cherty silt loam, 20 to 40 percent slopes
48 Razort loam, occasionally flooded
50 Spadra loam, occasionally flooded
51 Spadra loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes
54 Water

GENERAL NOTES

N

SCALE, FEET
0 300 600 900 1200

No.	Revision/Issue	Date

DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC
Consulting Engineers
PO Box 522, Mandan, ND 58554
(701) 663-1116, FAX: (701) 667-1356
www.dgaengineering.com

C&H HOG FARMS
GESTATION-FARROWING FARM

SECTION 26, T 15 N, R 20 W
NEWTON COUNTY, AR

FIELDS 5-7

DATE: MAY 29, 2012	SHEET: 2
SCALE: 1" = 600'	
DRAWN BY: NAP	
CHECKED BY: DLD	

FILE NAME: O:\PROJECT FILES\SMNE\HENSON\DFILES\PLAN



LEGEND

1 Arkana very cherty silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
2 Arkana–Moko complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
6 Cedo–Kenn complex, frequently flooded
11 Enders gravelly loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
13 Enders stony loam, 3 to 20 percent slopes
26 Moko–Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 50 percent slopes
35 Nella–Enders stony loams, 8 to 20 percent slopes
37 Nella–Steprock complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
42 Noark very cherty silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
43 Noark very cherty silt loam, 8 to 20 percent slopes
44 Noark very cherty silt loam, 20 to 40 percent slopes
48 Razort loam, occasionally flooded
50 Spadra loam, occasionally flooded
51 Spadra loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes
54 Water

GENERAL NOTES

SCALE, FEET
0 300 600 900 1200

No.	Revision/Issue	Date

DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC
Consulting Engineers
PO Box 522, Mandan, ND 58554
(701) 663-1116, FAX: (701) 667-1356
www.dgaengineering.com

C&H HOG FARMS
GESTATION-FARROWING FARM

SECTION 26, T 15 N, R 20 W
NEWTON COUNTY, AR

FIELDS 8-15

DATE: MAY 29, 2012	SHEET: 3
SCALE: 1" = 600'	
DRAWN BY: NAP	
CHECKED BY: DLD	

FILE NAME: C:\ PROJECT FILES\SWINE\HENSON\CFILES\PLAN



LEGEND

1 Arkana very cherty silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
2 Arkana–Moko complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
6 Ceda–Kenn complex, frequently flooded
8 Eden–Newnata complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
9 Eden–Newnata complex, 20 to 40 percent slopes
26 Moko–Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 50 percent slopes
37 Nella–Steprock complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
38 Nella–Steprock–Mountainburg very stony loams, 20 to 40 percent slopes
39 Nella–Steprock–Mountainburg very stony loams, 40 to 60 percent slopes
42 Noark very cherty silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
43 Noark very cherty silt loam, 8 to 20 percent slopes
44 Noark very cherty silt loam, 20 to 40 percent slopes
50 Spadra loam, occasionally flooded
54 Water

GENERAL NOTES

N

SCALE, FEET
0 250 500 750 1000

No.	Revision/Issue	Date

DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC
Consulting Engineers
PO Box 522, Mandan, ND 58554
(701) 663-1116, FAX: (701) 667-1356
www.dgaengineering.com

C&H HOG FARMS
GESTATION-FARROWING FARM

SECTION 3, T 14 N, R 20 W
NEWTON COUNTY, AR

FIELDS 15-16

DATE: MAY 29, 2012	SHEET: 4
SCALE: 1" = 500'	
DRAWN BY: NAP	
CHECKED BY: DLD	

FILE NAME: 05 PROJECT FILES/SWINE/HENSON/CFILES/PLAN



LEGEND

1 Arkana very cherty silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
2 Arkana–Moko complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
8 Eden–Newnata complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
13 Enders stony loam, 3 to 20 percent slopes
26 Moko–Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 50 percent slopes
36 Nella–Enders stony loams, 20 to 40 percent slopes
37 Nella–Steprock complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes
39 Nella–Steprock–Mountainburg very stony loams, 40 to 60 percent slopes
43 Noark very cherty silt loam, 8 to 20 percent slopes
44 Noark very cherty silt loam, 20 to 40 percent slopes

GENERAL NOTES

SCALE, FEET
0 250 500 750 1000

No.	Revision/Issue	Date

DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC
Consulting Engineers
PO Box 522, Mandan, ND 58554
(701) 663-1116, FAX: (701) 667-1356
www.dgaengineering.com

C&H HOG FARMS
GESTATION-FARROWING FARM

SECTION 3, T 14 N, R 20 W
NEWTON COUNTY, AR

FIELD 17

DATE: MAY 29, 2012	SHEET: 5
SCALE: 1" = 500'	
DRAWN BY: NAP	
CHECKED BY: DLD	

FILE NAME: 05 PROJECT FILES/SWINE/HENSON/CFILES/PLAN

Section G: Signed Manure Application Lease Agreements

SECTION G. SIGNED MANURE APPLICATION LEASE AGREEMENTS AND SETBACK REQUIREMENT WAIVER

1. Signed Land Use Agreements are shown for Fields 1-17.
2. Signed Setback Requirement Waiver

Land Use Contract

I, Jason Henson (Name of Landowner), agree to allow C+H Hog Farms, Inc. (Name of Permittee (matches application & AR SoS))

to land apply liquid animal (Type of Waste) waste from swine facility (Waste Source or Type of Waste Facility)

to 41.4 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County.

Field ID	New/ Existing	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
1	Existing	25	15N	20W	35.917	-93.058	15.6
2	Existing	25	15N	20W	35.916	-93.062	17
4	Existing	36	15N	20W	35.914	-93.061	8.8

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply liquid animal waste (Type of Waste) in accordance with the management plan developed and submitted to the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) as well as the requirements and conditions set forth in the permit issued by ADEQ. In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when land applying to my property:

The landowner agrees to provide or allow permittee to conduct soil analysis as required by ADEQ for each field listed in this land use contract prior to land application. Additionally, this approval may be terminated with written notice from the landowner.

Philip Campbell — Permittee's Signature — 4-5-18 — Date

Jason Henson — Landowner Signature — 4-5-18 — Date

Land Use Contract

I, Charles Campbell (Name of Landowner), agree to allow C+H Hog Farms, Inc. (Name of Permittee (matches application & AR SoS))

to land apply liquid animal (Type of Waste) waste from swine facility (Waste Source or Type of Waste Facility)

to 149.9 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County.

Field ID	New/ Existing	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
3	Existing	25	15N	20W	35.918	-93.065	13.6
8	Existing	35	15N	20W	35.916	-93.069	15.5
9	Existing	35	15N	20W	35.911	-93.068	41.2
13	Existing	35/2	15N/14N	20W	35.902	-93.076	101.6
14	Existing	35	15N	20W	35.905	-93.078	18.0

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply liquid animal waste (Type of Waste) in accordance with the management plan developed and submitted to the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) as well as the requirements and conditions set forth in the permit issued by ADEQ. In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when land applying to my property:

The landowner agrees to provide or allow permittee to conduct soil analysis as required by ADEQ for each field listed in this land use contract prior to land application. Additionally, this approval may be terminated with written notice from the landowner.

Phillip Campbell — Permittee's Signature — 4-9-18 — Date

Charles Campbell — Landowner Signature — 4-9-18 — Date

Land Use Contract

I, Billy Cheatham (Name of Landowner), agree to allow C+H Hog Farms, Inc. (Name of Permittee (matches application & AR SoS))

to land apply liquid animal (Type of Waste) waste from swine facility (Waste Source or Type of Waste Facility)

to 53.9 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County.

Field ID	New/ Existing	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
10	Existing	35	15N	20W	35.910	-93.071	33.2
11	Existing	35	15N	20W	35.910	-93.074	20.7

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply liquid animal waste (Type of Waste) in accordance with the management plan developed and submitted to the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) as well as the requirements and conditions set forth in the permit issued by ADEQ. In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when land applying to my property:

The landowner agrees to provide or allow permittee to conduct soil analysis as required by ADEQ for each field listed in this land use contract prior to land application. Additionally, this approval may be terminated with written notice from the landowner.

Phillip Campbell (Permittee's Signature) 11-9-18 (Date) Billy Cheatham (Landowner Signature) 4-9-18 (Date)

Land Use Contract

I, Robby Flud (Name of Landowner), agree to allow C+H Hog Farms, Inc. (Name of Permittee (matches application & AR SoS))

to land apply liquid animal (Type of Waste) waste from swine facility (Waste Source or Type of Waste Facility)

to 23.7 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County.

Field ID	New/ Existing	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
12	Existing	35	15N	20W	35.901	-93.069	23.7

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply liquid animal waste (Type of Waste) in accordance with the management plan developed and submitted to the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) as well as the requirements and conditions set forth in the permit issued by ADEQ. In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when land applying to my property:

The landowner agrees to provide or allow permittee to conduct soil analysis as required by ADEQ for each field listed in this land use contract prior to land application. Additionally, this approval may be terminated with written notice from the landowner.

Philip Campbell — Permittee's Signature — 4-9-18 — Date

Landowner Signature — 4-6-18 — Date

Land Use Contract

I, Barbara Hefley (Name of Landowner), agree to allow C+H Hog Farms, Inc. (Name of Permittee (matches application & AR SoS))

to land apply liquid animal (Type of Waste) waste from swine facility (Waste Source or Type of Waste Facility)

to 79.6 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County.

Field ID	New/ Existing	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
16	Existing	2/3	14N	20W	35.894	-93.076	79.6

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply liquid animal waste (Type of Waste) in accordance with the management plan developed and submitted to the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) as well as the requirements and conditions set forth in the permit issued by ADEQ. In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when land applying to my property:

The landowner agrees to provide or allow permittee to conduct soil analysis as required by ADEQ for each field listed in this land use contract prior to land application. Additionally, this approval may be terminated with written notice from the landowner.

Philip Campbell — Permittee's Signature — 4-9-18 — Date

Barbara Hefley — Landowner Signature — 4-9-18 — Date

Attachment I

LAND USE CONTRACT

I, Jacen Criner (Landowner), agree to allow Jason Henson (Operation Owner) to land apply waste from his/her Hog Farm (Type of Operation) operation located in the ____ (1/4 Section) 1/4 of Section 26 (Section) in Township 15 N (Township) and Range 20 W (Range) in Newton (County of Operation) County to 88.7 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County. A description of the areas to be used as land application sites are as follows:

Site No.	¼ Section	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
17	NE	3	14N	20W	35.901	-93.087	88.7
and	SW	34	15N	20W			
and	SE	34	15N	20W			

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas.

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply waste according to the management plan and guidelines and conditions set forth by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.

In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when applying waste to my land:

Jason Henson — Operation Owner Signature — 3-21-12 — Date

Jason Criner — Landowner Signature — 3-21-12 — Date

Attachment I

LAND USE CONTRACT

I, Loretta Ricketts (Landowner) agree to allow Jason Henson (Operation Owner) to land apply waste from his/her Hog Farm (Type of Operation) operation located in the ____ (1/4 Section) 1/4 of Section 26 (Section) in Township 15 N (Township) and Range 20W (Range) in Newton (County of Operation) County to 34.5 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County. A description of the areas to be used as land application sites are as follows:

Site No.	¼ Section	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
6	NE	26	15 N	20W	35.926	-93.069	34.5

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas.

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply waste according to the management plan and guidelines and conditions set forth by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.

In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when applying waste to my land:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____ Loretta Ricketts 5-19-12

Operation Owner Signature Date Landowner Signature Date

Attachment 1

LAND USE CONTRACT

I, Shan Ricketts (Landowner), agree to allow Jason Henson (Operation Owner) to land apply waste from his/her Hog Farm (Type of Operation) operation located in the ____ (1/4 Section) 1/4 of Section 26 (Section) in Township 15 N (Township) and Range 20 W (Range) in Newton (County of Operation) County to 23.8 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County. A description of the areas to be used as land application sites are as follows:

Site No.	¼ Section	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
5	NE	26	15N	20W	35.928	-93.071	23.8

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas.

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply waste according to the management plan and guidelines and conditions set forth by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.

In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when applying waste to my land:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____ Shan Ricketts 5-19-12

Operation Owner Signature Date Landowner Signature Date

Attachment 1

LAND USE CONTRACT

I, E. G. Campbell (Landowner), agree to allow Jason Henson (Operation Owner) to land apply waste from his/her Hog Farm (Type of Operation) operation located in the _____ (1/4 Section) 1/4 of Section 26 (Section) in Township 15N (Township) and Range 20W (Range) in Newton (County of Operation) County to 74.3 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County. A description of the areas to be used as land application sites are as follows:

Site No.	¼ Section	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
7	NE	26	15N	20W	35.922	-93.067	74.3
and	SE						

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas.

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply waste according to the management plan and guidelines and conditions set forth by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.

In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when applying waste to my land:

Jason Henson — Operation Owner Signature
3-21-12 — Date
E. G. Campbell — Landowner Signature
3-21-12 — Date

Attachment 1

LAND USE CONTRACT

I, Clayel Criner (Landowner), agree to allow Jason Henson (Operation Owner) to land apply waste from his/her Hog Farm (Type of Operation) operation located in the _____ (1/4 Section) 1/4 of Section 26 (Section) in Township 15N (Township) and Range 20W (Range) in Newton (County of Operation) County to 61 (Total Acreage Available) acres of my property located in Newton (County of Application Site) County. A description of the areas to be used as land application sites are as follows:

Site No.	¼ Section	Section	Township	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Available Acreage*
15	NW	2	14N	20W	35.896	-93.078	61

*Available acreage is the total acreage minus buffer zone areas.

I am also aware that the land applicator or the owner of the operation is to apply waste according to the management plan and guidelines and conditions set forth by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.

In addition to these guidelines, the following requirements must also be satisfied when applying waste to my land:

_____

_____

_____

_____

JASON HENSON — Operation Owner Signature
3-21-12 — Date
Clayel Criner — Landowner Signature
3-21-12 — Date

Setback Requirement Waiver

I, Zelmer Campbell, do hereby give consent to C & H Hog Farms, Inc. to apply wastewater and manure adjacent to my property line and neighboring occupied buildings. I understand this allows C & H Hog Farms to apply wastewater and manure within 50 feet of my property line and within 500 feet of neighboring occupied buildings.

Zelmer Campbell — 2-18-16

Landowner Signature — Date

Jason Henson — 2-18-16

C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Representative — Date

Setback Requirement Waiver

I, Darlene Kent, do hereby give consent to C & H Hog Farms, Inc. to apply wastewater and manure adjacent to my property line and neighboring occupied buildings. I understand this allows C & H Hog Farms to apply wastewater and manure within 50 feet of my property line and within 500 feet of neighboring occupied buildings.

Darlene Kent
Landowner Signature

2/18/16
Date

Jason Henson
C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Representative

2-18-16
Date

Setback Requirement Waiver

I, James C. Campbell, do hereby give consent to C & H Hog Farms, Inc. to apply wastewater next to my property line.

James C. Campbell
Landowner Signature

7-21-14
Date

Jason Henson
C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Representative

7-21-14
Date

012221

Field 14

Setback Requirement Waiver

I, Bob Freeman, do hereby give consent to C & H Hog Farms, Inc. to apply wastewater and manure adjacent to my property line and neighboring occupied buildings. I understand this allows C & H Hog Farms to apply wastewater and manure within 50 feet of my property line and within 500 feet of neighboring occupied buildings.

Bob Freeman — Landowner Signature

3-22-14 — Date

Jason Henson — C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Representative

3-22-14 — Date

Setback Requirement Waiver

I, Jason Baethke, do hereby give consent to C & H Hog Farms, Inc. to apply wastewater and manure adjacent to my property line and neighboring occupied buildings. I understand this allows C & H Hog Farms to apply wastewater and manure within 50 feet of my property line and within 500 feet of neighboring occupied buildings.

Landowner Signature — Date: 5-4-15

Jason Henson — Date: 5-4-15

C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Representative

Setback Requirement Waiver

I, Don T. Rockwell, do hereby give consent to C & H Hog Farms, Inc. to apply wastewater and manure adjacent to my property line and neighboring occupied buildings. I understand this allows C & H Hog Farms to apply wastewater and manure within 50 feet of my property line and within 500 feet of neighboring occupied buildings.

D Rockwell

Landowner Signature

3-26-14

Date

Jason Henson

C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Representative

3-26-14

Date

Setback Requirement Waiver

I, Brad Anderson, do hereby give consent to C & H Hog Farms, Inc. to apply wastewater next to my property line.

Brad Anderson
Landowner Signature

1-24-15
Date

Richard Hughes
C & H Hog Farms, Inc. Representative

1-24-15
Date

Section H: Soil Test Reports

SECTION H. SOIL TESTS REPORTS

Land application soil tests for nutrient application are attached. Prior to application the results will be recorded in the analysis sheets.

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	JH 1
Acres:	18
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179042
Sample Number:	3464449

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	87	174	Above Optimum
K	244	488	Above Optimum
Ca	1390	2780	--
Mg	134	268	--
SO4-S	14	28	--
Zn	8.2	16.4	--
Fe	131	262	--
Mn	195	390	--
Cu	1.7	3.4	--
B	0.7	1.4	--
NO3-N	11	22	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.5	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	11.31	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
77.89	61.48	9.88	5.53	1.00

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

	Crop	N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) (207)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

Apply the recommended rates of N, P, and K, in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for 1 week. For higher production, topdress an additional 60 lb N/Acre after every 4 to 6 weeks of grazing. For fall grazing apply 50 lb N/Acre in early August. Do not apply N after September 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	JH 2
Acres:	9
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179043
Sample Number:	3464450

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	104	208	Above Optimum
K	215	430	Above Optimum
Ca	883	1766	--
Mg	113	226	--
SO4-S	16	32	--
Zn	7.1	14.2	--
Fe	134	268	--
Mn	242	484	--
Cu	1.6	3.2	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	8	16	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.1	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	9.01	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
66.71	48.99	10.45	6.12	1.16

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	lb/acre						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) (207)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

Apply the recommended rates of N, P, and K, in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for 1 week. For higher production, topdress an additional 60 lb N/Acre after every 4 to 6 weeks of grazing. For fall grazing apply 50 lb N/Acre in early August. Do not apply N after September 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC 3
Acres:	17
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179044
Sample Number:	3464451

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	118	236	Above Optimum
K	92	184	Medium
Ca	1734	3468	--
Mg	99	198	--
SO4-S	11	22	--
Zn	7.1	14.2	--
Fe	215	430	--
Mn	207	414	--
Cu	2.3	4.6	--
B	0.7	1.4	--
NO3-N	10	20	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.5	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	12.84	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
76.63	67.53	6.43	1.84	0.85

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

If S deficiency has occurred previously on this field apply 20 lb SO4-S/Acre.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	JH 4
Acres:	11
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179045
Sample Number:	3464452

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	109	218	Above Optimum
K	161	322	Optimum
Ca	1230	2460	--
Mg	165	330	--
SO4-S	19	38	--
Zn	9.1	18.2	--
Fe	268	536	--
Mn	70	140	--
Cu	1.5	3	--
B	0.6	1.2	--
NO3-N	13	26	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.6	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	12.53	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
64.10	49.07	10.97	3.29	0.76

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	40	0	0	0	4000
Crop 2	Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) (207)	60	0	0	0	0	0	4000
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

Apply the recommended rates of N, P, and K, in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for 1 week. For higher production, topdress an additional 60 lb N/Acre after every 4 to 6 weeks of grazing. For fall grazing apply 50 lb N/Acre in early August. Do not apply N after September 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

UofA UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Analysis Report
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://www.uark.edu/depts/soiltest

JASON HENSON		Client ID:	8706881318
HC 72 BOX 10			
MTN JUDEA	AR		72655
Date Processed:	2/17/2012		
Field ID:	5		
Acres	40		
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No		
Leveled in past 4 years:	No		
Irrigation:	Unknown		
County:	Pope		
Lab Number:	36726		
Sample Number:	931078		

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	65	130	Above Optimum
K	108	216	Medium
Ca	2507	5014	--
Mg	118	236	--
SO4-S	12	24	--
Zn	6.1	12.2	--
Fe	134	268	--
Mn	128	256	--
Cu	1.7	3.4	--
B	0.0	0.0	--
NO3-N	15	30	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.7	---
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil ECEC	17	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silty Clay Loam - Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
82.2	74.4	5.8	1.6	0.3

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

	Crop	N	P2O5	K2O	SO4S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (207)	lb/acre						
Crop 1	Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) (207)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) (207)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 3								

4. Crop 1 Notes:

Apply the recommended rates of N, P, and K, in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for 1 week. For higher production, topdress an additional 60 lb N/Acre after every 4 to 6 weeks of grazing. For fall grazing apply 50 lb N/Acre in early August. Do not apply N after September 1.
If S deficiency has occurred previously on this field apply 20 lb SO4-S/Acre.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

Apply the recommended rates of N, P, and K, in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for 1 week. For higher production, topdress an additional 60 lb N/Acre after every 4 to 6 weeks of grazing. For fall grazing apply 50 lb N/Acre in early August. Do not apply N after September 1.
If S deficiency has occurred previously on this field apply 20 lb SO4-S/Acre.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

UofA UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Analysis Report
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://www.uark.edu/depts/soiltest

JASON HENSON		Client ID:	8706881318
HC 72 BOX 10			
MTN JUDEA	AR		72655

Date Processed:	2/17/2012
Field ID:	6
Acres	40
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	36727
Sample Number:	931079

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	76	152	Above Optimum
K	136	272	Optimum
Ca	876	1752	--
Mg	59	118	--
SO4-S	13	26	--
Zn	2.1	4.2	--
Fe	128	256	--
Mn	188	376	--
Cu	0.5	1.0	--
B	0.0	0.0	--
NO3-N	15	30	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.2	---
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil ECEC	8	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
67.8	56.4	6.3	4.5	0.6

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (207)	lb/acre						
Crop 1	Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) (207)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) (207)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 3								

4. Crop 1 Notes:

Apply the recommended rates of N, P, and K, in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for 1 week. For higher production, topdress an additional 60 lb N/Acre after every 4 to 6 weeks of grazing. For fall grazing apply 50 lb N/Acre in early August. Do not apply N after September 1.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

Apply the recommended rates of N, P, and K, in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for 1 week. For higher production, topdress an additional 60 lb N/Acre after every 4 to 6 weeks of grazing. For fall grazing apply 50 lb N/Acre in early August. Do not apply N after September 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	7
Acres:	70
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179046
Sample Number:	3464453

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	165	330	Above Optimum
K	73	146	Low
Ca	953	1906	--
Mg	112	224	--
SO4-S	15	30	--
Zn	10	20	--
Fe	205	410	--
Mn	187	374	--
Cu	2.8	5.6	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	8	16	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.7	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	10.00	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
60.01	47.64	9.33	1.87	1.17

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Hay (144)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm Season Grasses 4 ton (144)	160	0	220	0	0	0	4000
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	300	0	0	0	4000
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply fertilizer in split applications in late winter and after spring hay harvest. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. Split apply the recommended fertilizer rates after each subsequent hay harvest.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	7 PT 1
Acres:	35
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179047
Sample Number:	3464454

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	157	314	Above Optimum
K	70	140	Low
Ca	957	1914	--
Mg	110	220	--
SO4-S	14	28	--
Zn	9.5	19	--
Fe	200	400	--
Mn	174	348	--
Cu	2.9	5.8	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	7	14	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.7	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	10.00	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
59.99	47.86	9.17	1.80	1.17

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Hay (144)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm Season Grasses 4 ton (144)	160	0	220	0	0	0	4000
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	300	0	0	0	4000
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply fertilizer in split applications in late winter and after spring hay harvest. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. Split apply the recommended fertilizer rates after each subsequent hay harvest.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	7 PT 2
Acres:	35
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179048
Sample Number:	3464455

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	165	330	Above Optimum
K	72	144	Low
Ca	995	1990	--
Mg	111	222	--
SO4-S	14	28	--
Zn	9.2	18.4	--
Fe	203	406	--
Mn	183	366	--
Cu	2.8	5.6	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	10	20	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.8	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	10.21	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
60.83	48.72	9.06	1.81	1.23

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Hay (144)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm Season Grasses 4 ton (144)	160	0	220	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	300	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply fertilizer in split applications in late winter and after spring hay harvest. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. Split apply the recommended fertilizer rates after each subsequent hay harvest.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC 8
Acres:	14
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179049
Sample Number:	3464456

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	101	202	Above Optimum
K	84	168	Low
Ca	1977	3954	--
Mg	92	184	--
SO4-S	13	26	--
Zn	6.3	12.6	--
Fe	162	324	--
Mn	182	364	--
Cu	1.6	3.2	--
B	0.7	1.4	--
NO3-N	9	18	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.7	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	13.98	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
78.54	70.71	5.48	1.54	0.81

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	100	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	300	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC 9
Acres:	30
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179050
Sample Number:	3464457

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	101	202	Above Optimum
K	106	212	Medium
Ca	2395	4790	--
Mg	97	194	--
SO4-S	10	20	--
Zn	6.1	12.2	--
Fe	197	394	--
Mn	127	254	--
Cu	2.4	4.8	--
B	0.7	1.4	--
NO3-N	5	10	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.9	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	15.67	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silty Clay Loam - Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
84.05	76.41	5.16	1.73	0.75

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

If S deficiency has occurred previously on this field apply 20 lb SO4-S/Acre.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC 9A
Acres:	12
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179051
Sample Number:	3464458

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	66	132	Above Optimum
K	98	196	Medium
Ca	1938	3876	--
Mg	89	178	--
SO4-S	10	20	--
Zn	4.3	8.6	--
Fe	150	300	--
Mn	115	230	--
Cu	1.8	3.6	--
B	0.6	1.2	--
NO3-N	10	20	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.5	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	13.78	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
78.23	70.30	5.38	1.82	0.73

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

If S deficiency has occurred previously on this field apply 20 lb SO4-S/Acre.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC9 YE
Acres:	35
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179052
Sample Number:	3464459

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	89	178	Above Optimum
K	112	224	Medium
Ca	2410	4820	--
Mg	97	194	--
SO4-S	11	22	--
Zn	5.3	10.6	--
Fe	183	366	--
Mn	120	240	--
Cu	2.2	4.4	--
B	0.7	1.4	--
NO3-N	7	14	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.9	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	15.79	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silty Clay Loam - Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
84.17	76.32	5.12	1.82	0.91

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

If S deficiency has occurred previously on this field apply 20 lb SO4-S/Acre.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	F D 10
Acres:	15
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179054
Sample Number:	3464460

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	61	122	Above Optimum
K	92	184	Medium
Ca	1264	2528	--
Mg	120	240	--
SO4-S	13	26	--
Zn	5.4	10.8	--
Fe	270	540	--
Mn	118	236	--
Cu	1.8	3.6	--
B	0.4	0.8	--
NO3-N	7	14	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.5	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	13.18	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
58.26	47.96	7.59	1.79	0.92

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	4000
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	4000
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	BC 10A
Acres:	18
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179055
Sample Number:	3464461

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	102	204	Above Optimum
K	123	246	Medium
Ca	1300	2600	--
Mg	128	256	--
SO4-S	14	28	--
Zn	7.6	15.2	--
Fe	199	398	--
Mn	166	332	--
Cu	1.8	3.6	--
B	0.4	0.8	--
NO3-N	7	14	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.9	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	11.50	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
69.56	56.52	9.28	2.74	1.02

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	10 YE
Acres:	29
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179056
Sample Number:	3464462

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	100	200	Above Optimum
K	129	258	Medium
Ca	1287	2574	--
Mg	129	258	--
SO4-S	15	30	--
Zn	7	14	--
Fe	234	468	--
Mn	154	308	--
Cu	1.9	3.8	--
B	0.4	0.8	--
NO3-N	7	14	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.9	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	11.47	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
69.48	56.12	9.37	2.88	1.10

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	FD 11
Acres:	19
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179057
Sample Number:	3464463

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	65	130	Above Optimum
K	195	390	Above Optimum
Ca	732	1464	--
Mg	143	286	--
SO4-S	17	34	--
Zn	5.5	11	--
Fe	173	346	--
Mn	163	326	--
Cu	1	2	--
B	0.4	0.8	--
NO3-N	11	22	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.7	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	9.43	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
57.56	38.83	12.64	5.30	0.78

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	0	0	0	0	4000
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	0	0	0	0	4000
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	RF 12
Acres:	13
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179058
Sample Number:	3464464

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	138	276	Above Optimum
K	193	386	Above Optimum
Ca	1424	2848	--
Mg	136	272	--
SO4-S	18	36	--
Zn	6.6	13.2	--
Fe	224	448	--
Mn	166	332	--
Cu	2	4	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	17	34	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.8	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	13.37	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
66.35	53.24	8.47	3.70	0.94

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC 13
Acres:	13
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179059
Sample Number:	3464465

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	94	188	Above Optimum
K	170	340	Optimum
Ca	1824	3648	--
Mg	140	280	--
SO4-S	15	30	--
Zn	9.9	19.8	--
Fe	124	248	--
Mn	327	654	--
Cu	1.9	3.8	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	12	24	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.4	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	14.31	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
75.55	63.71	8.15	3.05	0.64

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	40	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	200	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC13YE
Acres:	51
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179060
Sample Number:	3464466

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	88	176	Above Optimum
K	158	316	Optimum
Ca	1819	3638	--
Mg	136	272	--
SO4-S	14	28	--
Zn	9.8	19.6	--
Fe	110	220	--
Mn	346	692	--
Cu	1.7	3.4	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	13	26	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6.5	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	13.71	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
78.12	66.33	8.27	2.95	0.57

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	40	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	200	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	CC 14
Acres:	15
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	1790€1
Sample Number:	3464467

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	65	130	Above Optimum
K	129	258	Medium
Ca	789	1578	--
Mg	129	258	--
SO4-S	17	34	--
Zn	10.9	21.8	--
Fe	134	268	--
Mn	304	608	--
Cu	1.3	2.6	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	7	14	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	8.45	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
64.48	46.71	12.73	3.92	1.13

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	250	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683

Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	C1C 15
Acres:	28
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179062
Sample Number:	3464468

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	133	266	Above Optimum
K	170	340	Optimum
Ca	969	1938	--
Mg	193	386	--
SO4-S	16	32	--
Zn	14.3	28.6	--
Fe	124	248	--
Mn	355	710	--
Cu	2	4	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	11	22	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.9	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	9.99	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
69.97	48.50	16.10	4.36	1.00

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	40	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	200	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	C1C 15B
Acres:	21
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179063
Sample Number:	3464469

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	145	290	Above Optimum
K	270	540	Above Optimum
Ca	1165	2330	--
Mg	179	358	--
SO4-S	18	36	--
Zn	13.3	26.6	--
Fe	139	278	--
Mn	329	658	--
Cu	1.6	3.2	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	19	38	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	11.62	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam - Silty Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
69.87	50.14	12.84	5.96	0.94

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	C1C15YE
Acres:	38
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179064
Sample Number:	3464470

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	132	264	Above Optimum
K	207	414	Above Optimum
Ca	971	1942	--
Mg	182	364	--
SO4-S	17	34	--
Zn	13.7	27.4	--
Fe	124	248	--
Mn	326	652	--
Cu	1.8	3.6	--
B	0.6	1.2	--
NO3-N	19	38	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	6	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	10.01	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
70.03	48.50	15.15	5.30	1.09

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	BH 16
Acres:	21
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179082
Sample Number:	3464471

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	58	116	Above Optimum
K	138	276	Optimum
Ca	944	1888	--
Mg	111	222	--
SO4-S	13	26	--
Zn	4.4	8.8	--
Fe	195	390	--
Mn	165	330	--
Cu	1.5	3	--
B	0.4	0.8	--
NO3-N	8	16	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	5.7	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	10.07	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silt Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
60.27	46.88	9.19	3.51	0.69

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Pasture (212)	---------- lb/acre ----------						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm-Season Grasses for Pasture (212)	60	0	40	0	0	0	4000
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	200	0	0	0	4000
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply N in late winter. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. For higher production, topdress 50 lb N/Acre after every 4-6 weeks of grazing or as needed.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE
RESEARCH & EXTENSION
University of Arkansas System

Cooperative Extension Service
Soil Testing And Research Laboratory
Marianna, AR 72360
http://soiltest.uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

JASON HENSON	Client ID: 8706881318
HC 72 BOX 2	
VENDOR	AR 72683
Date Processed:	12/1/2017
Field ID:	JC 17
Acres:	36
Lime Applied in the last 4 years:	No
Leveled in past 4 years:	No
Irrigation:	Unknown
County:	Pope
Lab Number:	179083
Sample Number:	3464472

1. Nutrient Availability Index

Nutrient	Concentration		Soil Test Level (Mehlich 3)
	ppm	lb/acre	
P	87	174	Above Optimum
K	72	144	Low
Ca	2123	4246	--
Mg	84	168	--
SO4-S	12	24	--
Zn	8.3	16.6	--
Fe	139	278	--
Mn	171	342	--
Cu	1.9	3.8	--
B	0.5	1	--
NO3-N	11	22	--

2. Soil Properties

Property	Value	Units
Soil pH (1:2 soil-water)	7	--
Soil EC (1:2 soil-water)		umhos/cm
Soil Estimated CEC	13.65	cmolc/kg
Organic Matter (Loss on Ignition)		%
Estimated Soil Texture	Silty Clay Loam - Clay Loam	

Estimated Base Saturation (%)				
Total	Ca	Mg	K	Na
85.35	77.78	5.13	1.35	1.08

3. Recommendations

(Notice: State and/or federal nutrient management regulations may supersede these agronomic recommendations.)

Crop		N	P2O5	K2O	SO4-S	Zn	B	Lime
Last Crop	Hay (144)	lb/acre						
Crop 1	Mixed Cool and Warm Season Grasses 4 ton (144)	160	0	220	0	0	0	0
Crop 2	Hay - Warm-Season Grasses (MNT) - 6 ton/acre (134)	300	0	300	0	0	0	0
Crop 3	Reg 5 - Analysis Only (21)							

4. Crop 1 Notes:

To favor cool-season grasses, apply fertilizer in split applications in late winter and after spring hay harvest. To favor warm-season grasses, do not apply N until May 1. Split apply the recommended fertilizer rates after each subsequent hay harvest.

5. Crop 2 Notes:

For optimum fertilizer efficiency, divide the recommended N, P, and K rates by the estimated number of harvests/year. Make the first fertilizer application in spring when night temperatures are > 60 degrees F for one week. Make subsequent applications following each harvest. Do not apply N after Sept. 1.

If S deficiency has occurred previously on this field apply 20 lb SO4-S/Acre.

6. Crop 3 Notes:

Section I: Nutrient Test Results and How to

SECTION I. NUTRIENT TESTS RESULTS & HOW TO

The nutrient tests have been conducted at this time and are included in this report. Below are a list of available manure testing labs.

Laboratories Providing Manure Testing Services

- Agvise Laboratories
  902 13th St. N, P.O. Box 187
  Benson, MN 56215
  (320) 843-4109
  http://www.agviselabs.com

- A&L Heartland Labs, Inc.
  111 Linn Street, P.O. Box 455
  Atlantic, IA 50022
  (800) 434-0109
  (712) 243-5213
  http://allabs.com

- Servi-Tech Laboratories
  1602 Park Dr. West
  Hastings, NE 68902
  (402) 463-3522
  (800) 557-7509
  http://www.servitechlabs.com

- Ward Laboratories
  4007 Cherry Ave., P.O. Box 788
  Kearney, NE 68848
  (308) 234-2418
  (800) 887-7645
  http://www.wardlab.com/

- Midwest Laboratories
  13611 "B" St.
  Omaha, NE 68144
  (402) 334-7770
  https://www.midwestlabs.com/

- Stearns DHIA Laboratories
  825 12th Street South, PO Box 227
  Sauk Centre, MN 56378
  (320) 352-2028
  http://www.stearnsdhialab.com/

- University of Arkansas
  1366 West Altheimer Dr
  Fayetteville, AR 72704
  (479) 575-3908

How to Sample Manure for Nutrient Analysis

A field-by-field nutrient management program requires multiple components to maintain adequate fertility for crop growth and development. A well-designed soil sampling plan, including proper soil test interpretations along with manure sampling, manure nutrient analysis, equipment calibration, appropriate application rates and application methods are all necessary components of a nutrient management plan. Implementing these components allows manure to be recognized and used as a credible nutrient resource, potentially reducing input costs and the potential of environmental impacts.

Animal manure has long been used as a source of nutrients for crop growth. Standard nutrient values are guides to determine the amount of nutrients that animal manure will supply as a fertilizer source. Iowa State University Extension publication, *Managing Manure Nutrients for Crop Production* (PM 1811), recommends manure nutrient content and credits by type of animal, handling system and application methods.

While "book values" like those in PM-1811 are reasonable average values, an individual farm's manure analyses can vary from those averages by 50 percent or more. Species, age of animal, feed rations, water use, bedding type, management, and other factors make every farm's manure different. Two key factors affecting the nutrient content of manure are manure handling and type of storage structures used. Each handling system results in different types of nutrient losses—some unavoidable and others that can be controlled to a certain degree. Because every livestock production and manure management system is unique, the best way to assess manure nutrients is by sampling and analyzing the manure at a laboratory.

This publication describes how to sample solid, semi-solid, and liquid manure. Manure with greater than 20 percent solids (by weight) is classified as dry manure and is handled as a solid, usually with box-type spreaders. Manure with 10 to 20 percent solids is classified as semi-solid manure and can usually be handled as a liquid. Semi-solid manure usually requires the use of chopper pumps to provide thorough agitation before pumping. Manure with less than 10 percent solids is classified as liquid manure and is handled with pumps, pipes, tank wagons, and irrigation equipment.

A representative manure sample is needed to provide an accurate reflection of the nutrient content. Unfortunately, manure nutrient content is not uniform within storage structures, so obtaining a representative sample can be challenging. Mixing and sampling strategies should therefore insure that samples simulate as closely as possible the type of manure that will be applied.

When to Sample Manure

Sampling manure prior to application will ensure that you receive the analysis in time to adjust nutrient application rates based on the nutrient concentration of the manure. However, sampling manure prior to application may not completely reflect the nutrient concentration of the manure due to storage and handling losses if long periods of time pass before application begins or when liquid storage facilities are not adequately agitated while sampling. "Pre-sampling" such as dipping samples off the top of storage structure for nitrogen (N) and potassium (K) concentrations, can be done to estimate application rates. (See page 3 for more on pre-sampling). Producers must remember to go back and determine the actual nutrient rates applied by using manure samples collected during application and calculating volumes.

For best results, manure should be sampled at the time of application or as close as possible to application. Sampling during application will help to ensure that samples are well-mixed and representative of the manure being applied. Because manure nutrient analysis typically takes several days at a lab, sampling at the time of application will not provide immediate manure nutrient recommendations. The results can, however, be used for subsequent manure applications and to adjust commercial fertilizer application. This is why it is important to develop a manure sampling history and use those analyses in a nutrient management plan. A manure sampling history will also help you recognize if unplanned changes have occurred to your system if management and other factors have remained constant. A manure sampling history will give you confidence in using manure, and show you how consistent nutrient concentration is from year to year.

Take manure samples annually for three years for new facilities, followed with samples every three to five years, unless animal management practices, feed rations, or manure handling and storage methods change drastically from present methods. If you apply manure several times a

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
University Extension

PM 1558 Revised November 2003

year, take samples when you plan to apply the bulk of manure. For example, it may be appropriate to sample in the spring when manure that has accumulated all winter will be applied. If storages are emptied twice a year, it may be necessary to sample in both spring and fall since the different storage temperatures in summer versus winter will affect manure nutrient levels. *NOTE: Implementation of future federal regulations may require concentrated animal feeding operations (> 1,000 animal units) to sample annually. Please check state and federal requirements to determine sampling frequency.*

How to Sample Semi-Solid or Liquid Manure

In liquid and semi-solid systems, settled solids can contain over 90 percent of the phosphorus (P), so complete agitation is needed to accurately sample the entire storage if all the manure in the storage structure is going to be applied. If, however, solids will purposely be left on the bottom of the storage structure when the manure is pumped out, as is sometimes the case with lagoons, then complete agitation during sampling may generate artificially high nutrient values. In this case agitation of the solids or sludge on the bottom of a lagoon is not needed for nutrient analysis.

Liquid manure is best sampled during land application, for it is potentially more difficult and dangerous to sample from liquid storage facilities than dry manure systems. When sampling manure during application is not possible, or pre-application analysis is desired for determining rates, refer to the section on sampling from a storage facility. If sampling from a liquid storage facility, use caution to prevent accidents, such as falling into the manure storage facility or being overcome with hazardous gases produced by manure. Have two people present at all times. Never enter confined manure storage spaces without appropriate safety gear such as a self-contained breathing apparatus.

Ideally, liquid manure should be agitated so a representative sample can be obtained for laboratory analysis. When agitating a storage pit below a building, be sure to provide adequate ventilation for both animals and humans. When agitating outdoor unformed pits, monitor activities closely to prevent erosion of berms or destruction of pit liners.

Liquid Manure Sample Preparation

All liquid samples should be handled as follows:

- Prior to sampling label a plastic bottle with your name, date and sample identification number using a waterproof pen.
- If the sample cannot be mailed or transported to a laboratory within a few hours, it should be frozen. Place the container in a tightly sealed plastic bag and keep it cold or frozen until it arrives at the laboratory.
- Most manure analysis laboratories do have plastic bottles available for sample collection. Do not use glass containers, as expansion of the gases in the sample can cause the container to break.

Liquid Manure Sampling During Land Application

Liquid Manure Applied with Tank Wagons

- Since settling begins as soon as agitation stops, samples should be collected as soon as possible after the manure tank wagon is filled unless the tanker has an agitator.
- Immediately after filling the tank wagon, use a clean plastic pail to collect manure from the loading or unloading port or the opening near the bottom of the tank. Be sure the port or opening does not have a solids accumulation from prior loads.
- Use a ladle to stir the sample in the bucket to get the solids spinning in suspension. While the liquid is spinning remove a ladle full and carefully pour in the sample bottle. See Figure 1.
- Repeat this procedure and take another sample until the sample bottle is three-quarters full (Make sure the manure solids have not settled to the bottom of the bucket as each ladle is extracted; it is important to include the solids in the sample). Screw the lid on tightly.

Figure 1. Collecting a liquid manure sample.

Liquid Manure Applied by Irrigation Systems

- Place catch pans or buckets randomly in the field to collect liquid manure that is applied by an irrigation system. Inexpensive aluminum roasting pans or plastic buckets can be used as catch pans. Use several pans at different distances from the sprinkler head.
- Immediately after the manure has been applied, collect manure from catch pans or buckets and combine the manure in one bucket to make one composite sample.
- Use a ladle to stir the sample in the bucket. While the liquid is spinning remove a ladle full and carefully pour into a sample bottle. See Figure 1.
- Repeat this procedure and take another sample until the sample bottle is three-quarters full. Screw the lid on tightly.

Liquid Manure Sampling from Storage Facilities

For best sampling results, samples should be taken with a sampling probe or tube (see Figure 2). Probes can be constructed out of 1.5-inch diameter PVC pipe. Cut the PVC pipe a foot longer than the depth of the pit. Run a 1/4 -inch rod or string through the length of the pipe and attach a plug such as a rubber stopper or rubber ball (see Figure 3). The rod or the string must be longer than the pipe. If using a rod, bend the top over to prevent it from falling out of the pipe.

- Insert the pipe slowly into the pit or lagoon, with the stopper open, to the full depth of the pit.

Figure 2. Sampling earthen basin with sampling probe.

- Pull the string or rod to close the bottom of the pipe and extract the vertical profile sample inside the pipe (be careful not to tip the pipe and dump the sample).
- Release the sample carefully into a bucket.
- Repeat the process at least three times around the pit or lagoon creating a composite sample in the bucket.
- Use a ladle to stir the sample in the bucket to get the solids spinning in suspension. While the liquid is spinning,

Section J: Mortality Disposal Actions

SECTION J. Livestock Mortality Management Plan

Mortalities will be disposed with an incinerator. The use of an incinerator to dispose of the carcasses uses propane or diesel. The ashes are land applied. Incinerators reduce carcasses to ashes. The Incinerator meets state requirements for burners and emissions. Minimum incinerator capacity shall be based on the average daily weight of animal mortality and the length of time the incinerator will be operated each day.

In the case of emergency when it may not be possible for the incinerator to keep up a proposed emergency burial site will be used.

The primary method of carcass disposal in the future may be In-Vessel Composter called a BIOvator.

The following is an Excerpt from Act 87 of 1963-Code 2-33-101 and Act 150 of 1985-Code 19-6-448 by the Arkansas Livestock and Poultry Commission

Carcasses may be buried at a site at least 100 yards away from a well and in a place where a stream cannot be contaminated. Anthrax carcasses are to be covered with 1 inch of lime. Other carcasses may be covered with lime, particularly when needed to control odors. All carcasses are to be covered with at least 2 feet of dirt. Carcasses are not to be buried in a landfill, without prior approval of the State Veterinarian.

Act 87 of 1963, Act 150 of 1985, and Act 522 of 1993: ***Disposal of carcass of animal dying from contagious or infectious disease.***

9141. Any person that has the care or control of any animal that dies from any contagious disease shall immediately cremate or bury the animal.

9142. An animal which has died from any contagious disease shall not be transported, except to the nearest crematory. The transportation of the animal to the crematory shall be pursuant to such regulations as the director may adopt.

9143. An animal which has died from any contagious disease shall not be used for the food of any human being, domestic animal, or fowl.

Section K: Livestock Feed Management

The Professional Animal Scientist 13:99–111



Environmental Nutrition: Nutrient Management Strategies to Reduce Nutrient Excretion of Swine

E. T. KORNEGAY, PAS and A. F. HARPER, PAS
Department of Animal and Poultry Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0306

Abstract

Intensive production of swine has brought an increase in the volume of manure produced on farms with limited land area. Exceeding the capacity of soil and crops to handle this volume of manure results in nutrient accumulation in and on the soil that can produce leakage of nutrients to the environment and pollution could result. Environmental nutrition is defined as the concept of formulating cost-effective diets and feeding animals to meet their minimum mineral needs for acceptable performance, reproduction, and carcass quality with minimal excretion of minerals. Pigs normally excrete 45 to 60% of N, 50 to 80% of Ca and P, and 70 to 95% of K, Na, Mg, Cu, Zn, Mn, and Fe when fed diets containing commonly used feedstuffs. Although it is not possible to make pigs 100% efficient in utilization of nutrients, it is possible to reduce the amount of nutrients excreted through careful nutrient management. Several strategies are possible for reducing nutrients excreted: 1) improvements in feed efficiency, 2) more accurate nutrient requirement information for animals and compositional data for feed ingredients, 3) reduced feeding of excess nutrients through overformulation, 4) feeding for optimal rather than maximum performance, 5) use of crystalline amino acids and high quality protein, 6) improving the availability of P and some other minerals, 7) use of phase feeding and separate-sex feeding, and 8) reduced feed waste. Some strategies have a much greater potential for reducing nutrients excreted than other strategies. In the future, diet formulation and feeding must be integrated into total production systems so that swine production systems are environmentally safe as well as economically viable.

(Key Words: Environment, Nutrient Management, Pigs.)

Introduction

Pigs traditionally have been fed to maximize performance with little or no regard for nutrients excreted. During the past decades, advances in genetics, nutrition, housing, physiology, disease control, and management have resulted in major improvements in the efficiency of swine production. Along with these improvements has been an increase in the size and intensity of production units to maximize the benefits from these improvements and to optimize the use of capital, labor, and facilities. This large increase in size of animal units, however, has led to an overall increase in environmental burdens, such as excessive amounts of waste and odor. Commercial swine production is an essential component of our food supply. However, this important agricultural enterprise is being restricted in some countries and will be restricted in other countries if solutions to the problem of manure disposal and odor control are not developed and implemented.

Because of the high nutrient content of manure, and thus fertilizing value, land application has been the major means of manure disposal. However, there are limits to the amount of manure that can be applied to the land because of nutrient build-up in and on the soil. The potential environmental impact of nutrient contamination of the environment is perceived as a major issue facing livestock producers in many countries (15, 19, 40, 90). A major concern for surface water quality is the eutrophication of lakes and streams (20), and P, not N, is the limiting nutrient for algae and other aquatic plant growth (75, 80). Also, an excessive build-up of nutrient levels in the soil is of long-term concern because of potential pollution through ground water and soil

Reviewed by R. D. Jones and L. J. Boyd.

erosion and run-off, as well as a potential reduction in crop yield.

To avoid leakage to the environment and potential pollution, governments in many countries are passing legislation requiring nutrient management plans for each farm, thus the amount of manure that can be applied to the land is being regulated (35). Most states in the U.S. are starting to monitor farms where large numbers of food-producing animals are maintained on a small acreage. Coffey (15) has stated that technology does exist for concentrated production of livestock in an environmentally sound manner. However, he also said that even though good technology exists today, there are opportunities for reducing nutrients excreted, and thus reducing land requirements.

Managing manure in swine confinement systems has always been a problem, and it will be a much greater problem and challenge in the future because the volume of manure per production unit has increased as production units have increased in size and intensity. Also, environmental concerns have increased and will continue to increase in the future as indicated by all trade magazines and newspapers for livestock and poultry agriculture. Two equally important approaches must be taken in dealing with this challenge: First, the amount of nutrients being excreted must be reduced; and second, the nutrients that are excreted must be recycled in a manner that is not damaging to the environment. It was stated in 1981 by the Agricultural Research Council (4) that the concept of a minimum requirement of a mineral that sustains an acceptable standard performance of pigs needed to be developed and should be cost-beneficial. Environmental nutrition is defined as the concept of formulating cost-effective diets and feeding animals to meet their minimum mineral needs for acceptable performance, reproduction, and carcass quality with minimal excretion of minerals. This paper discusses methods of reducing nutrient excretion in manure as an important component of the solution to this environmental problem.

Assumptions and Nutrients of Concern

There are four basic assumptions in this concept of environmental nutrition. 1) All animals will excrete some nutrients; therefore, 100% efficiency will not be reached. 2) The total farm production system must be sustainable and nutrients should not become detrimental to the environment. 3) Manure is biodegradable — it is made up of various organic and inorganic nutrients and can serve as a source of nutrients for both plants and animals when managed properly. 4) Swine producers want to contribute to a healthy environment; consumers, however, must recognize that additional production costs may result and must ultimately be paid by them.

Digestion and retention coefficients for N and several minerals are given in Table 1 for various sizes of pigs. Generally, pigs only retain from 20 to 55% of the N consumed. The amount of Ca and P retained can vary from 20 to 72% with slightly more Ca retained than P. The retention of Mg, Na, and K vary from 5 to 38% of that consumed. The retention of Zn, Cu, Fe, and Mn is also low, with values ranging from 8 to 45% of the intake. Younger animals may be slightly more efficient than older animals, but there is also a larger database for the younger animals. Other factors can influence the retention of N and minerals. The amount of minerals retained as a percentage of intake decreases as intake increases. The retention of chemically bound forms of some minerals will be increased if they are released in the digestive tract. For example, phytase can enhance the retention of Ca, P, and Zn. Fiber is known to decrease the retention of some minerals. Therefore, the bioavailability of the mineral source will influence the retention of minerals.

Of the nutrients present in manure, N, P, K, and trace minerals (probably Cu and Zn) are of greatest concern. There is general agreement that P and N are currently the two elements in manure that limits the rate of land application, but there is disagreement as to which one is of greatest concern. In the Netherlands, manure disposal is a major concern on swine and poultry farms because of the small land base of these farms (28). However, within Dutch animal agriculture, the dairy and swine industries are the largest contributors to manure production. In the Netherlands, there are laws that regulate the amount and method of waste disposal. These regulations will become more restrictive by the yr 2000 (28).

Nitrogen is used as the base to regulate the amount of manure that can be applied to the land in many areas, including the U.S. However, in the future it is likely that N and P will be the nutrients that limit land application of manure in more intensive swine and poultry producing areas. Results of a recent livestock nutrient assessment in North Carolina (7) supports the position that P may well be the nutrient that determines the amount of manure that can be applied to many soils and crops. Barker and Zublena (7) reported that statewide animal and poultry manure could provide about 20% of the N and 66% of the P requirements of all nonlegume agronomic crops and forage. However, these researchers found that 3 of 100 counties in North Carolina had enough manure to exceed all crop N requirements, and 18 counties had enough manure to exceed crop P needs.

High P levels in the soil have also been reported for many states. Sweeten (86) estimated that for the 145.5 metric tons of manure produced annually by livestock and poultry in the U.S., pigs excrete about 23% of the P and poultry excrete about 13%. Dairy cattle excreted 12% of the total P in all manure. Sims (84) reported that

TABLE 1. Digestion and retention of nitrogen and minerals by different classes of pigs.

Minerals	Class or size of pigs			
	Young	Finishing	Gestating	Lactating
Nitrogen				
Digested, %	75 to 88	75 to 88	88	–
Retained, %	40 to 50	40 to 50	35 to 45	20 to 40
Calcium				
Digested, %	55 to 75	40 to 50	10 to 37	19 to 26
Retained, %	40 to 72	25 to 50	35	–
Phosphorus				
Digested, %	20 to 70	20 to 50	3 to 45	1 to 35
Retained, %	20 to 60	20 to 45	20 to 35	20
Magnesium				
Digested, %	20 to 45	28 to 38	14 to 21	7 to 18
Retained, %	20 to 38	15 to 26	–	–
Sodium				
Digested, %	–	35 to 70	–	–
Retained, %	–	13 to 26	–	–
Potassium				
Digested, %	–	60 to 80	–	–
Retained, %	5 to 10	10 to 20	–	5
Zinc digested, %	20 to 45	10 to 20	–	–
Copper digested, %	18 to 25	10 to 20	–	–
Iron digested, %	30 to 35	5 to 35	–	–
Manganese digested, %	17 to 40	8 to 18	–	–

Data for this table was adapted from Adeola (1), Adeola et al. (2), Apgar and Kornegay (3), Bruce and Sundstal (11), Coppoolse et al. (18), Dungelhoef et al. (29), Everts (32), Jongbloed (43), Jongbloed et al. (46, 47), Kornegay et al. (56), Kornegay (50), Kornegay and Kite (54), Kornegay and Qian (55), Lantzsch and Drochner (58), Lindemann et al. (62), Moore et al. (64), Näsi (66), Pallauf et al. (71, 72, 73, 74), Qian et al. (76), Swinkels et al. (87), Verstegen (91), Vipperman et al. (94), Yi et al. (98).

recent surveys reveal that several states had found greater than 50% of the soil samples tested for crop production to be rated high or excessive in P. These states include Maine, Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Ohio, Iowa, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Arizona, and Washington. The impact of high P levels in the soil has been reviewed recently by Pierzynski et al. (75), Sharpley (79), Sharpley et al. (80, 81), and Crenshaw and Johanson (20). Phosphorus currently is the nutrient that regulates the amount of waste that can be applied to the land in some countries and will probably replace N in other countries, but in the long-term Cu and Zn may be of concern.

Soil analyses of a Sampson County, NC, bermudagrass pasture that was fertilized with swine lagoon effluent to satisfy N requirements showed approximately a 400% increase in P and Zn, a 100% increase in K, and a 300% increase in Cu to a depth of 91 cm during the 3-yr period of application (Table 2; 65).

Starting in 1978 through 1992, the application of Cu-rich pig manure (from pigs fed 255 ppm Cu as $CuSO_4$) at an average annual rate of 80 ton/acre (22.4% DM) to three soil types increased the soil DTPA (diethylenetriaminepentaacetic acid) extractable concentration of P, Cu, and Zn in the Ap and upper B horizon (D. C. Martens and E. T. Kornegay, unpublished data). The average annual rate of application per acre was 21.9 lb of Cu, 7.1 lb of Zn, and 378.6 lb of P. The application of a similar amount of Cu from $CuSO_4$ resulted in similar increases in Cu. For example, high quality deep core soil samples taken in the spring of 1996 revealed that the increases varied based on soil type and treatment (Table 3). There were 9.0-, 19.6-, and 3.6-fold increases in extractable Cu for silt loam (0 to 12 in), sandy loam (0 to 10 in), and clay loam (0 to 4 in) soils, respectively, in the Ap horizon when Cu-rich pig manure and $CuSO_4$ were added. There were 2.1-, 2.5-, and 2.6-fold increases in extractable Zn, respectively, when Cu-rich pig manure was added. Also, there were 2.4-, 5.7-, and 11.7-fold increases in extractable P, respectively, when Cu-rich pig manure was added. There were some increases in the upper B or A_2 horizons, but the magnitude of the increases was much less and the total concentration for all soils and treatments was much less. Little effect of treatments for the different soil types was observed below the upper B or A_2 horizon. The Cu (2.3 to 2.6 ppm) and Zn (16.8 to 20.3 ppm) concentrations of the grain grown on these soils were not changed. Corn ear leaf tissue had a slightly higher Cu concentration (113 to 172% of controls) but Zn concentrations were similar. Phosphorus was not measured in plant tissue and grain. Grain yield was not decreased by Cu application during any year on the three soil types.

Strategies for Reducing Nutrients Excreted

The following strategies for reducing nutrients excreted will be briefly discussed and examples given: 1) Improvement of feed efficiency; 2) Reduction of "overformulation" or nutrient excesses; 3) More accurate

TABLE 2. Soil analyses for a Sampson County, NC bermuda-grass pasture fertilized with swine lagoon effluent[a].

	P[b]		K[b]		Zn		Cu	
Depth	1990	1992	1990	1992	1990	1992	1990	1992
(cm)	(ppm)							
0 to 15	118	212	147	191	1.28	5.28	0.47	2.65
15 to 30	39	190	184	183	0.38	2.39	0.48	1.65
30 to 61	4	46	355	1389	0.20	1.38	0	1.78
61 to 91	3	14	298	797	0.26	1.02	0	1.21

[a]Swine lagoon effluent was added at a rate to meet the N needs of the bermudagrass pasture. Initial sample was taken June 28, 1990 and final sample taken December 2, 1992. Adapted from Mueller et al. (65).

[b]Assumed P_2O_5 contained 43.64% P and K_2O contained 82.98% K.

nutrient requirements of animals and compositional information for feed ingredients; 4) Feeding for optimal rather than maximum performance; 5) Use of crystalline amino acids and high quality protein; 6) Improvement of the availability of P and some other minerals; 7) Use of phase feeding and separate-sex feeding; and 8) Reduction of feed waste. Other strategies, such as controlling disease and parasites, providing a comfortable environment, and reducing stress are also very important and can lead to improved efficiency, but will not be discussed in this paper. Some strategies have a much greater potential for reducing nutrients excreted than others, and some strategies will be more applicable than others depending on the individual farm situation.

Improvement of Feed Efficiency. Improvements in overall feed efficiency can produce a major reduction in the excretion of nutrients. Coffey (15) reported that a reduction in the feed to gain ratio of 0.25 percentage units (i.e., 3.00 vs 3.25), would reduce N excretion by 5 to 10%. Henry and Dourmad (40) reported for growing-finishing pigs that for each 0.1 percentage unit decrease in feed to gain ratio there was a 3% decrease in N output. Feed efficiency can be improved in several ways: 1) Improvements in the genetic potential of animals can have a tremendous impact on feed efficiency. 2) Proper formulation of diets using high quality ingredients will also improve feed efficiency. 3) The use of certain processing and feeding methods can further improve feed efficiency. 4) Although sometimes controversial, the use of repartitioning agents can result in improvements in feed efficiency and major improvements in carcass muscling.

Reduction of Overformulation or Nutrient Excesses. The amount of nutrients excreted can be reduced by decreasing "overformulation" or the inclusion of excess levels of nutrients in the diet. Traditionally, the main consideration of diet formulation was to maximize the growth and health of the animal. Little concern was shown for excess nutrients excreted. Results of numerous surveys of the nutrient composition of diets being fed indicate that excesses of several nutrients continues to be included in the diet. Some nutritionists refer to these excesses as a safety factor. Excess nutrients may be included in the diet to account for the variability of nutrient composition of feed ingredients, or to make up for a lack of knowledge concerning the availability of the nutrients in the feed ingredients used. More recently, it has been argued that higher nutrient levels are required because of possible genetic differences in nutrient requirements. Whether this is true or not remains to be proven. Results of surveys reported by Cromwell (22) of the Ca and P recommendations of several universities and feed companies indicated that feeding excess P may be a common practice (Table 4). The average range of university recommendations were 110 to 120% of NRC (69) guidelines, whereas the average range of industry recommendations were 120 to 130% of NRC (69) guidelines. Spears (85) reported results of diets analyzed by the North Carolina Feed Testing Laboratory for sows and finishing pigs (Table 5). Excesses of most minerals were observed. The median levels as a percentage of NRC (69) guidelines were 140 to 192 for Ca, P, and Na; 390 to 525 for K and Mg; 334 to 776 for Cu, Fe, and Zn; and 770 to 3,100 for Mn. Minerals such as P, Cu, and Zn may be of greater environmental concern. Other surveys in the past have reported similar results of the inclusion of excess nutrients in the diet.

A large decrease in the excretion of minerals can be obtained by diet formulation to more accurately meet nutrient requirements. Latimer and Pointillart (59) reported that finishing pigs fed diets containing 0.5% P grew as fast and as efficiently as those fed 0.6% P, but P excretion was 33% less for pigs fed the lower level of P. Walz et al. (95) reported that supplemental amino acids (lysine, methionine + cystine, threonine, and tryptophan) improved protein retention of pigs fed a low protein diet (25% less than recommended by German guidelines); N excretion was reduced approximately 30%. The use of more precise composition and nutrient availability data for feed ingredients, and better defined nutrient requirements for animals, will allow for the formulation of diets that better meet the needs of the animal at the various stages of production. A reduction in the amount of excess

TABLE 3. Mehlich-3 extractable Cu, Zn, and P concentrations in three soil types after 16 annual applications of Cu-rich manure and $CuSO_4$.

			Cu			Zn			P		
Horizon	Depth	Class[a]	Control	Cu manure	Cu sulfate	Control	Cu manure	Cu sulfate	Control	Cu manure	Cu sulfate
	(cm)		(ppm[b])			(ppm[b])			(ppm[b])		
					Bertie						
A_p	0 to 29	fsl	4.3[d]	35.3[c]	42.1[c]	15.8[d]	32.7[c]	15.1[d]	295.0[d]	697.5[c]	295.0[d]
Upper B	30 to 61	fsl	0.4[d]	2.2[c]	1.5[c]	0.8[d]	1.6[c]	0.8[c]	9.1[d]	230.2[c]	11.9[d]
Lower B	62 to 86	fsl	0.4[c]	0.3[c]	0.3[c]	0.5[c]	0.4[c]	0.6[c]	0.8[c]	11.4[c]	0.1[c]
Upper C	87 to 112	sil	0.3[c]	0.2[c]	0.4[c]	0.4[c]	0.4[c]	0.4[c]	0.1[c]	0.9[c]	0.1[c]
Lower C	113 to 133	sil	0.2[c]	0.5[c]	0.4[c]	0.4[c]	0.6[c]	0.5[c]	0.1[c]	0.9[c]	0.1[c]
					Guernsey						
A_p	0 to 25	sil	3.1[d]	59.6[c]	62.2[c]	19.5[d]	49.4[c]	21.2[d]	176.3[d]	1011.7[c]	199.1[d]
Upper B	26 to 50	sic	0.6[d]	3.0[c]	1.6[cd]	1.1[d]	2.2[c]	0.8[d]	15.4[d]	83.2[c]	19.1[d]
Middle B	51 to 75	sicl	1.1[c]	0.7[c]	0.7[c]	0.9[c]	0.5[c]	0.5[c]	1.9[c]	1.2[c]	3.6[c]
Lower B	76 to 100	sic	0.6[c]	1.2[c]	1.4[c]	0.5[c]	0.7[c]	0.7[c]	0.1[c]	0.1[c]	0.1[c]
					Starr-Dyke						
A_p	0 to 11	sicl	14.8[d]	53.7[c]	54.2[c]	16.9[d]	43.2[c]	23.1[d]	38.3[d]	447.9[c]	77.2[d]
A_2	12 to 25	sic	1.8[d]	9.8[c]	9.2[c]	2.5[d]	7.6[c]	3.4[d]	0.2[d]	130.7[c]	0.3[d]
Upper B	26 to 50	c	1.0[c]	1.1[c]	1.2[c]	1.0[c]	0.9[c]	0.8[c]	0.1[c]	2.0[c]	0.1[c]
Middle B	51 to 75	c	0.5[c]	0.5[c]	0.5[c]	0.5[c]	0.4[c]	0.4[c]	0.1[c]	0.1[c]	0.1[c]
Lower B	76 to 100	c	0.8[c]	0.6[c]	0.7[c]	1.0[c]	0.5[d]	0.7[cd]	0.1[c]	0.1[c]	0.1[c]

[a]Fsl = fine sandy loam, scl = sandy clay loam, sil = silt loam, sicl = silty clay loam, and c = clay.
[b]ppm = mg/dm^3. Multiply mg/dm^3 (ppm) by 1.78 to get lb/acre.
[cd]Means on the same line with different superscipt letters are different ($P<0.05$).

nutrients fed will reduce the amount of nutrients excreted.

More Accurate Estimates of Animal Nutrient Requirements and Compositional Information for Feed Ingredients. Recommended nutrient requirements have been published for the various classes of pigs in a number of countries, including the U.S. (69), United Kingdom (4), Australia (78), Netherlands (12, 13), and France (42). However, these recommendations often vary and, in many cases, are only estimates for an "average" type of animal under "average" environmental conditions. Some of the variation in the estimated nutrient requirements developed by the different countries could be explained by differences in genetic potential, feeding methods, environmental conditions, ingredients used, animal response criteria, and even the philosophy of the authors. With the exception of P, nutrient requirements are generally based on the total nutrient rather than the available nutrient. In some cases, such as NRC (69), nutrient requirements are based on corn-soybean meal diets or diets with similar availabilities of nutrients as in a corn-soybean meal diet. Also, these requirements are often based upon the use of certain feed-grade mineral sources. In pigs, the use of the "ideal protein" concept as first proposed by ARC (4) is being developed and may be incorporated in a new revision of U.S. NRC nutrient guidelines for swine. Reassessment of "ideal protein" continues as indicated by recent publications (5, 6, 9, 33). Along with the use of ideal protein is the use of ileal digestibility values of amino acids (8, 61, 88), which allow for more precise dietary formulation when using a variety of feed ingredients.

Available nutrient requirements of animals can only be accurately met if the compositional data of feed ingredients are expressed on an available nutrient compositional basis. Thus, more knowledge of the availability of the nutrients in ingredients will be required to take the full benefit of more precisely balancing the needs of animals.

Pig type has changed during the last decade because of strong consumer pressure for leaner, heavier muscled carcasses. For example, the nutrient needs of the high lean growth lines of pigs may be greater than those of pigs with lower potential for lean growth. Daily feed intake could influence the percentage composition of nutrients required,

TABLE 4. Comparison of Ca and P requirements and allowances recommended by universities and feed companies[a].

Mineral	Growing-Finishing 20 to 50 kg	Growing-Finishing 50 to 100 kg	Gestation	Lactation
	(%)			
Calcium				
NRC (69)	0.60	0.50	0.75	0.75
1986 Survey[a]				
Universities	0.66	0.59	0.82	0.79
Feed industry	0.74	0.63	0.95	0.93
1988 Survey[b]				
Universities	0.64	0.58	0.84	0.84
Feed industry	0.73	0.62	0.93	0.90
Phosphorus				
NRC (69)	0.50	0.40	0.60	0.60
1986 Survey[a]				
Universities (n=25)	0.55	0.49	0.66	0.63
Feed industry (n=35)	0.60	0.52	0.77	0.76
1988 Survey[b]				
Universities (n=7)	0.54	0.49	0.68	0.68
Feed industry (n=21)	0.60	0.52	0.76	0.74

[a]Overfield (70) reported by Cromwell (22).
[b]Survey conducted in 1988 (Cromwell, 22).

and it may be necessary to increase the percentage composition if pigs eat less than the predicted feed intakes. However, most of this information must be developed and tested. Also, the requirements of barrows, gilts and boars are probably different, especially during the finishing phase of production.

Feeding for Optimal Rather than Maximum Performance. In the future, diets can be formulated so that animals perform at slightly less than maximum because the benefit of adding additional units of a nutrient to achieve maximum performance produces benefits at a decreasing rate. This practice increases nutrient costs per unit of performance improvement at an increasing rate as the animal approaches maximum performance. As the maximum response is reached, or as the performance curve reaches a plateau, a greater amount of the nutrient is required to get a change in the response (Figure 1). In a series of three trials, Combs et al. (16) fit asymptotic models of the effect of total Ca+P intake (varied above and below NRC recommended requirement) and days on test (weaning to market). Diminishing returns in response to Ca-P input are shown in Figure 2 for performance measurements. This principle of diminishing returns in response to nutrient input is not new. Heady et al. (38) reported that in 14 of 16 yr, swine diets formulated using the diminishing return concept would have produced greater profits than diets formulated for maximum gain. Diminishing returns were also observed when Kornegay (52) fit asymptotic models to combined data from a number of research trials conducted from 1969 to 1986 to evaluate the Ca+P needs of growing-finishing swine. More recently, Gahl et al. (34) reported that the most economical daily weight gain does not necessarily occur when daily weight gain is maximized and would change as feedstuffs and input costs change. Diminishing returns for N gain of pigs fed six levels of lysine from three supplemental sources (Figure 3) has been demonstrated by Gahl et al. (34); their paper includes a good discussion of the diminishing returns in response to nutrient input.

Another consideration in evaluating nutrient addition is the response criteria measured. It is well known that the amount of P required to maximize growth is less than the amount required to maximize bone integrity (69). Perhaps, from the perspective of animal well-being, attempts to maximize bone integrity are most important. But from an environmental perspective, attempts to maximize bone integrity results in excessive excretion of P (20). Combs et al. (17) observed that growing-finishing pigs fed diets that provided NRC (69) requirements for Ca and P maintained approximately 100% of maximum growth and feed efficiency, but approximately 120 to 130% of the NRC (69) Ca and P requirement was required to maximize bone development. Although maximizing bone development is not necessary for the production of a market pig, a more difficult question is how much bone development is required to prevent damage to the carcass during mechanical processing that occurs during slaughter. As the



Figure 1. Example of diminishing returns for nutrient inputs as the level of nutrient fed increases. Adapted from Crenshaw et al. (21). At point A, one unit of input produces 0.27 units of gain, whereas, at point B, one unit of input produces 0.05 units of gain.

TABLE 5. Mineral concentrations in sow and finishing swine diets[a].

Minerals	Sow: Requirement NRC (69)	Sow: Range	Sow: Median[b]	Sow: Median requirement
Calcium, %	0.75	0.62 to 2.01	1.21	1.61
Phosphorus, %	0.60	0.45 to 1.17	0.84	1.40
Sodium, %	0.15	0.13 to 0.45	0.22	1.47
Magnesium, %	0.04	0.12 to 0.44	0.21	5.25
Potassium, %	0.20	0.43 to 1.15	0.78	3.90
Copper, ppm	5	12 to 222	22	4.40
Iron, ppm	80	162 to 698	376	4.70
Manganese, ppm	10	28 to 203	77	7.70
Zinc, ppm	50	79 to 497	167	3.34

Minerals	Finishing swine: Requirement	Finishing swine: Range	Finishing swine: Median[b]	Finishing swine: Median requirement
Calcium, %	0.50	0.57 to 1.38	0.96	1.92
Phosphorus, %	0.40	0.45 to 0.78	0.62	1.55
Sodium, %	0.10	0.13 to 0.29	0.19	1.90
Magnesium, %	0.04	0.13 to 0.21	0.16	4.00
Potassium, %	0.17	0.48 to 0.93	0.72	4.23
Copper, ppm	3	9 to 281	20	6.67
Iron, ppm	40	131 to 503	311	7.76
Manganese, ppm	2	37 to 160	62	31.0
Zinc, ppm	50	103 to 205	149	2.98

[a]Results are from analyses conducted recently at the North Carolina Feed Testing Laboratory (n=26 for sow and n=17 for finishing diets). Adapted from Spears (85).
[b]The median level for each mineral indicates that 50% of the sample analyzed were below and 50% were above the median value.

cost of disposing of P increases, the Ca and P levels fed will decrease. In the future, nutritionists will formulate for 95 to 98% of maximum response rather than trying to approach 100% of maximum response. Therefore, the industry will feed below rather than above the nutrient requirements of animals to maximize growth and bone development. How much of a safety margin will be desirable will depend upon the availability of accurate knowledge of the requirements and compositional information for the feedstuffs.

Use of Crystalline Amino Acids and High Quality Protein. The concept of ideal protein and the use of crystalline amino acids are now widely accepted. The use of crystalline amino acids in nonruminant feeding can substantially reduce the amount of N excreted without affecting performance (23, 41, 49, 89). Henry and Dourmad (41) and Van der Honing et al. (89) reported that N excretion can be reduced 15 to 20% when crude protein levels are reduced two percentage units and crystalline amino acids are added to correct amino acid balance. Cromwell (23) reported that the crude protein level of swine diets can be reduced about two percentage units (i.e., 14 vs 16% crude protein) by using crystalline lysine; this can result in a 22% decrease in N excreted (Table 6). The crude protein level of corn-soybean meal diets can be reduced about four percentage units (i.e., 10 vs 14% crude protein) by using four amino acids (lysine, threonine, tryptophan, and methionine); this can result in a 41% decrease in N excreted. After summarizing the results of 10 studies, Kerr and Easter (49) suggested that for each 1 percentage unit reduction in dietary protein combined with crystalline amino acid supplementation, total N losses (fecal and urinary) could be reduced approximately 8%. The use of low quality protein sources such as hydrolyzed hog hair meal, and high levels of crude fiber increase N excretion (50, 51). Also, as nonruminant animals are fed more precisely to meet their amino acid needs, feed efficiency will be improved, which can further reduce N excreted as well as the excretion of other nutrients.

Improve the Availability of P and Some Other Minerals. The amount of P excreted can be significantly decreased, if the availability of the bound (or unavailable) P, known as phytate P, in plants is improved. It has been demonstrated in pigs and poultry that the use of an exogenous enzyme, phytase, can improve plant P availability, thereby reducing P excretion. For example, in a corn soybean meal diet, commonly used for pigs and poultry, two-thirds of the P is bound and is unavailable (24). However, by using the appropriate amount of microbial phytase, 20 to 50% of the bound P can be released and made available to the animal. Thus, the amount of inorganic P that must be added to meet the P requirement is reduced. If total dietary P levels are decreased, then the amount of P excreted can be decreased 20 to 50% (27, 46, 47). Estimates of reductions in fecal P resulting from different levels of supplemental phytase representing 25 studies and 17 references (26, 29, 30, 31, 37, 39, 55, 60, 63, 66, 67, 68, 72, 82, 83, 93, 96) were used in a data set (Kornegay, unpublished data) to determine the relationship between supplemental phytase levels and fecal P reduction.



Figure 2. Percentage of maximum average daily gain (*) average daily feed intake (•) and gain:feed ratio (□) associated with each increase in average daily Ca and P (CAP) intake for growing-finishing pigs. Taken from Combs et al. (16).

The model included study as a fixed effect and the linear and quadratic effects of phytase level (units per kilogram). The quadratic effect was not significant ($P<0.97$) and was removed from the model used to derive the following equation: $Y = 25.57 + 0.0106X$, $R^2 = 0.95$, where Y equals the fecal P reduction (percentage of adequate P level), and X = supplemental phytase level (units per kilogram). Based on this equation, 500 U/kg of dietary phytase would result in a 30.9% decrease in fecal P, which is higher than 21.5% observed in a recent growing-finishing study (37). Assuming that a 21% reduction in P excretion results in a similar reduction in P content of land applied manure, then 21% less application area would be needed under a given P loading rate.

The nutritional, environmental, and economic considerations for using phytase in pig and poultry diets were recently reviewed (53). Based on response surface equations and nonlinear and linear equations calculated from the data, it was concluded that the magnitude of the response to microbial phytase is influenced by the dietary level of available P (and total P including phytate P), the amount of phytase activity added, and the Ca to available P ratio. Currently in the U.S., based on replacement values of inorganic P by microbial phytase calculated from nonlinear and linear equations, the cost of adding phytase range from one to three times the cost of an equivalent amount of inorganic P (53). This cost, however, does not include any cost for P disposal. Based on a representative feeder-to-finish swine farm generated from the Duplin County, NC Swine Database, Zhu et al. (99) estimated that for a 20% reduction in P excretion, with the inclusion of 500 U/kg of phytase, the savings in manure disposal cost would be $0.42 per hog with a net advantage of $0.16 per hog for using phytase. A genetically engineered microbial phytase is now being marketed in the several countries, including the U.S. The addition of microbial phytase to high phytate diets also releases Ca (57, 77, 78, 92), Zn (10, 60, 96), and some amino acids (48, 97) that may be bound by the phytate complex.

Use of Phase Feeding and Separate-Sex Feeding. The requirement of animals for most available amino acids and minerals, expressed as a percentage of the total diet, decreases as the animals grow heavier. Phase feeding, as some have described it, is a way to more precisely meet the nutrient needs of growing and finishing pigs. This concept applied to dietary crude protein is illustrated in Table 7 and Figure 4. It is known that nutrient requirements change (perhaps weekly) as pigs grow; if a producer is able to change the formulation of the diet as the nutrient requirements change, then the nutrient needs of the animal can be met more precisely, thereby, reducing the total quantity of nutrients excreted. Henry and Dourmad (41) reported that N excretion could be reduced approximately 15% when



Figure 3. Diminishing returns in nitrogen gain (grams per day) of pigs fed diets with graded concentrations of lysine. Panel A: Predicted curves estimated using a logistic equation. Data points ± SE (n = 4) for each treatment group. Panel B: Marginal efficiency of nitrogen gain with respect to lysine intake calculated as the first derivative of the predicted curves in Panel A. Marginal efficiency is defined as the incremental response in nitrogen gain to an incremental unit of lysine intake. Taken from Gahl et al. (34).

the feeding of 14% CP diet was initiated at 60 kg body weight, rather than the continuous feeding of 16% CP grower diet to market weight. In a further study, Chauvel and Ganier (14) reported a 9% reduction in N excretion between a multiphase system in which the proportions of an 18.9 and 14.9% CP (4.1 and 2.6 g digestible lysine/Mcal net energy, respectively) were changed weekly from 24 to 107 kg vs a two-phase system, in which an 18.1% CP (3.6 g lysine/Mcal net energy) diet was fed to 66 kg and a 16.1% CP (3.1 g lysine/Mcal net energy) diet was fed to 107 kg. Also, the excretion of P and other minerals would be reduced a similar amount, if the finishing diet contained a lower level of these minerals. Henry and Dourmad (41) suggested that this change could be made gradually by changing the ratio in which a "high" protein and P (and other minerals) grower diet is mixed with a "low" protein and P (and other minerals) finishing diet.

Separate-sex or split-sex feeding of swine can further improve feed efficiency. It is well established that gilts consume less feed on an ad libitum basis and require greater diet nutrient density than barrows (25). By penning and feeding gilts and barrows separately, producers can more precisely formulate diets for specific sexes and avoid overfortification and excessive excretion of nutrients. Furthermore, increased fat deposition and decreased rate of lean deposition occurs at an earlier growth stage in barrows than in gilts; therefore, dietary protein and amino acid levels can be more precisely changed at different growth stages for each sex. Under such precise feeding conditions, the total quantity of N and other minerals fed and excreted can be reduced.

Reduction of Feed Waste. Another simple, yet sometimes difficult and overlooked way to improve feed efficiency is to improve design and operation of feeders, so that feed waste is minimized. Studies have shown that feed waste accounts for up to 3 to 8% of the feed fed. The impact that feed waste has on feed efficiency and income loss, as well as the amount of N and P excreted in pigs is shown in Table 8 (36). A 5% level of feed waste can result in an income loss of $1.77 per market pig depending on market condition, and an additional 327 g of N and 82 g of P excreted per pig. The use of proper feeder designs, regular maintenance,

TABLE 6. Theoretical model of the effects of reducing dietary protein and supplementing with amino acids on N excretion by 90-kg finishing pigs[a].

N balance	14 % CP	12% CP + Lys	10% CP + Lys + Thr + Trp + Met
N intake, g/d	67	58	50
N digested and absorbed, g/d	60	51	43
N excreted in feces, g/d	7	7	7
N retained, g/d	26	26	26
N excreted in urine, g/d	34	25	17
N excreted, total, g/d	41	32	24
Reduction in N excretion, %	–	22	41

[a]Assumes an intake of 3,000 g/d, a growth rate of 900 g/d, a carcass lean tissue gain of 400 g/d, a carcass protein gain of 100 g/d (or 16 g of N/d), and that carcass N retention represents 60% of the total N retention. Adapted from Cromwell (23).

TABLE 7. Effect of feeding strategy during the growing-finishing period (25 to 105 kg) on N output[a].

Item	Single-feed 17% CP	Two-feeds[b] 17-15% CP	Three-feeds[c] 17-15-13% CP
N output, g/d	31.9	29.0	26.7
Percentage of two-feed strategy	110	100	92

[a]Adapted from Henry and Dourmad (40).
[b]Crude protein changed at 55 kg.
[c]Crude protein changed at 50 and 75 kg.

TABLE 8. Feed waste impacts on nutrient management[a].

Feed waste	Feed loss per pig	Income loss per pig	Feed N waste per pig	Feed P waste per pig
(%)	(kg)	($)	(g)	
1	2.8	0.36	63	18
3	8.2	1.07	195	50
5	13.6	1.77	327	82
7	19.1	2.48	459	114

[a]Based on growing-finishing pigs from 22.7 to 113.5 kg body weight, 3:1 feed:gain ratio, 2.4% N and 0.60% P in the diet and $0.13/kg diet cost. Adapted from Harper (36).



Figure 4. Example of a one phase and a nine phase feeding program for the growing and finishing phase.

and careful adjustment of feeders is essential for the prevention of excessive feed waste.

Conclusions

As swine production units have become larger and more intensive, the need for environmentally sound methods to use and dispose of excreted nutrients has increased. Safe and effective disposal of waste nutrients in swine production depends on reducing the quantity of nutrients excreted by the animals coupled with recycling of the excess nutrients in a manner that is not harmful to the environment. In the future, swine feed formulators must focus on optimizing swine performance while reducing or minimizing nutrient excretion. This review describes existing and emerging

technologies that would allow this goal to be achieved. Some individual technologies will have a greater impact on reduced nutrient excretion than others. Furthermore, employing these technologies together in an environmental nutrition approach to swine feeding has the potential to significantly reduce excess nutrients for disposal in swine production.

Literature Cited

1. Adeola, O. 1995. Digestive utilization of minerals by weanling pigs fed copper-and phytase-supplemented diets. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 75:603.

2. Adeola, O., B. V. Lawrence, A. L. Sutton, and T. R. Cline. 1995. Phytase-induced changes in mineral utilization in zinc-supplemented diets for pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 73:3384.

3. Apgar, G. A., and E. T. Kornegay. 1996. Mineral balance of finishing pigs fed copper sulfate or a copper lysine complex at growth stimulating levels. J. Anim. Sci. 74:1594.

4. ARC. 1981. The Nutrient Requirements for Farm Livestock. 3. Pigs. Agricultural Research Council, London, UK.

5. Baker, D. H. 1996. Advances in amino acid nutrition and metabolism of swine and poultry. In Nutrient Management of Food Animals to Enhance and Protect the Environment. E. T. Kornegay (Ed.). p 51. CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, FL.

6. Baker, H., and T. K. Chung. 1992. Ideal protein for swine and poultry. Kyowa Hakko Technical Review-4. Nutri-Quest Inc., Chesterfield, MO.

7. Barker, J. C., and J. P. Zublena. 1995. Livestock manure nutrient assessment in North Carolina. In Proc. of 7th Int. Symp. on Agric. and Food Processing Wastes. Sponsored by ASAE, Chicago, IL.

8. Batterham, E. S. 1994a. Ileal digestibilities of amino acids in feedstuffs for pigs. In Amino Acids in Farm Animal Nutrition. J.P.F. D'Mello (Ed.). p 113. CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon, UK.

9. Batterham, E. S. 1994b. Protein and energy relationships for growing pigs. In Principles of Pig Science. D.J.A. Cole, J. Wiseman, and M. A. Varley (Eds.). p 107. University Press, Nottingham, Oxon, UK.

10. Biehl, R. R., D. H. Baker, and H. F. DeLuca. 1995. 1 -Hydroxylated cholecalciferol compounds act additively with microbial phytase to improve phosphorus, zinc and manganese in chicks fed soy-based diets. J. Nutr. 125:2407.

11. Bruce, J.A.M., and F. Sundstael. 1995. The effect of microbial phytase in diets for pigs on apparent ileal and faecal digestibility, pH and flow of digesta measurements in growing pigs fed a high-fibre diet. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 75:121.

12. Centraal Veevoederbureau (CVB). 1990. Revised table on available phosphorus in feedstuffs for pigs. Centraal Veevoederbureau, Lelystad, The Netherlands (in Dutch).

13. Centraal Veevoederbureau (CVB). 1991. Table of feedstuffs. Information about composition, digestibility and feeding value. Centraal Veevoederbureau, Lelystad, The Netherlands (in Dutch).

14. Chauvel, J., and R. Granier. 1996. Effet de l'alimentation multiphase sur la croissance et les rejets azotes du porc charcutier. J. Rec. Porc. France 28:249.

15. Coffey, M. T. 1992. An industry perspective on environmental and waste management issues: challenge for the feed industry. Georgia Nutr. Conf., p 144. Athens, GA.

16. Combs, N. R., E. T. Kornegay, M. D. Lindemann, and D. R. Notter. 1991a. Calcium and phosphorus requirement of swine from weaning to market weight: 1. Development of response curves for performance. J. Anim. Sci. 69:673.

17. Combs, N. R., Kornegay, E. T., Lindemann, M. D., Notter, D. R., Wilson, J. H., and Mason, J. P. 1991b. Calcium and phosphorus requirement of swine from weaning to market weight: II. Development of response curves for bone criteria and comparison of bending and shear bone testing. J. Anim. Sci. 69:682.

18. Coppoolse, J., A. M. van Vuuren, J., Huisman, W.M.M.A. Janssen., A. W. Jongbloed, N. P. Lenis, P.C.M. Simons. 1990. Excretion of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium by livestock, now and tomorrow. DLO, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

19. Council for Agricultural Science and Technology. 1995. Integrated Animal Waste Management Task Force Report No. 128. Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, Ames, IA.

20. Crenshaw, T. D., and J. C. Johanson. 1995. Nutritional strategies for waste reduction management: Minerals. In New Horizons In Anim. Nutr. and Health. J. B. Longenecker and J. W. Spears (Eds.). The Institute of Nutrition of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Nov. 7 and 8, Chapel Hill, NC.

21. Crenshaw, T. D., M. J. Gahl, K. P. Blemings, and N. J. Benevenga. 1994. Swine feeding programs optimum performance and economic considerations. In Tenth Annual Carolina Swine Nutr. Conf., Nov. 10., p 21. Raleigh, NC.

22. Cromwell, G. L. 1989. An evaluation of the requirements and biological availability of calcium and phosphorus for swine. In Feed Phosphates in Monogastric Nutrition, Texasgulf Nutrition Symposium, May 23, Raleigh, NC.

23. Cromwell, G. L. 1994. Feeding strategies urged as techniques to decrease pollution from hog manure. Feedstuffs, July 25, p 9.

24. Cromwell, G. L., and R. D. Coffey. 1991. Phosphorus — a key essential nutrient, yet a possible major pollutant — its central role in animal nutrition. In Biotechnology in the Feed Industry. T. P. Lysons (Ed.). p 133. Alltech Technical Publications, Nicholasville, KY.

25. Cromwell, G. L., T. R. Cline, J. D. Crenshaw, T. D. Crenshaw, R. C. Ewan, C. R. Hamilton, A. J. Lewis, D. C. Mahan, E. R. Miller, J. E. Pettigrew, L. F. Tribble, and T. L. Veum. 1993a. The dietary protein and(or) lysine requirements of barrows and gilts. J. Anim. Sci. 71:1510.

26. Cromwell, G. L., R. D. Coffey, G. R. Parker, H. J. Monegue, and J. H. Randolph. 1995. Efficacy of a recombinant-derived phytase in improving the bioavailability of phosphorus in corn-soybean meal diets for pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 73:2000.

27. Cromwell, G. L., T. S. Stahly, R. D. Coffey, H. J. Monegue, and J. H. Randolph, 1993b. Efficacy of phytase in improving the bioavailability of phosphorus in soybean meal and corn-soybean meal diets for pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 71:1831.

28. de Lange, C.F.M. 1994. Formulation of diets to minimize the contribution of livestock to environmental pollution. American Feed Industry Association Nutrition Council Symp., Nov. 10–11, St. Louis, MO.

29. Dungelhoef, M., M. Rodehutscord, H. Spiekers, and E. Pfeffer. 1994. Effects of supplemental microbial phytase on availability of phosphorus contained in maize, wheat and triticale to pigs. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 49:1.

30. Eeckhout, W., and M. De Paepe. 1992a. Influence d'une phytase microbienne sur la digestibilite apparente du phosphore d'aliments pour porcelets. Rev. L'Agric. 45:183.

31. Eeckhout, W. and M. De Paepe. 1992b. Phytase de ble, phytase microbienne et digestibilite apparente du phosphore d'un aliment simple pour porcelets. Rev. L'Agric. 45:195.

32. Everts, H. 1994. Nitrogen and energy metabolism of sows during several reproductive cycles in relation to nitrogen intake. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wageningen, The Netherlands.

33. Fuller, M. F., R. MacWilliam, T. C. Wang, and L. R. Giles. 1989. The optimum dietary amino acid pattern for growing pigs. 2. Requirements for maintenance and for tissue protein accretion. Br. J. Nutr. 62:255.

34. Gahl, M. J., T. D. Crenshaw, and N. J. Benevenga. 1995. Diminishing returns in weight, nitrogen, and lysine gain of pigs fed six levels of lysine from three supplemental sources. J. Anim. Sci. 73:3177.

35. Hacker, R. R., and Z. Du. 1993. Livestock pollution and politics. In Nitrogen flow in pig production and environmental consequences. M.W.A. Verstegen, L. A. den Hartog, G.J.M. van Kempen, and C.J.H.M. Metz. EAAP Publ. 69. p 3. Pudoc Scientific Publishers, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

36. Harper, A. F. 1994. Feeding technologies to reduce excess nutrients in swine diets. In Proc. Meeting the Challenge of Environmental Management on Hog Farms. Second Annual Virginia Tech Swine Producers Seminar. August 4. p 44. Carson, VA.

37. Harper, A. F., E. T. Kornegay, and T. C. Schell. 1997. Phytase supplementation of low phosphorus growing-finishing pig diets improves performance, phosphorus digestibility and bone mineralization, and reduces phosphorus excretion. J. Anim. Sci. 75:(in press).

38. Heady, E. O., R. Woodworth, D. R. Catron, and G. C. Ashton. 1954. New procedures in estimating feed substitution rates and in determining economic efficiency in pork production. Agric. Exp. Sta. Res. Bull. p 893. Iowa State College, Ames, IA.

39. Helander, E. 1995. Efficiency of microbial phytases on phosphorus utilization in growing-finishing pigs. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

40. Henry, Y., and J. Y. Dourmad. 1992. Protein nutrition and N pollution. Feed Mix. (May):25.

41. Henry, Y., and J. Y. Dourmad. 1993. Feeding strategies for minimizing nitrogen outputs in pigs. In Nitrogen flow in pig production and environmental consequences. Proc. First Int. Symp. on Nitrogen flow in Pig Production and Environmental Consequences. EAAP Publication No. 69. p 137.

42. INRA. 1984. L'alimentation des animaux monogastriques, porc, lapin, volailles. Institut National De La Recherche Agronomique, Paris, France.

43. Jongbloed, A. W. 1991. Developments in the production and composition in manure from pigs and poultry. In Mest & Milieu in 2000. H.A.C. Verkerk (Ed.). Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek, Wageningen, The Netherlands (in Dutch).

44. Jongbloed, A. W., P. A. Kemme, Z. Mroz, and R. ten Bruggencate. 1995a. Apparent total tract digestibility of organic matter, N, Ca, Mg, and P in growing pigs as affected by levels of Ca, microbial phytase and phytate. Proc. 2nd European Symp. on Feed Enzymes. p 198. Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands.

45. Jongbloed, A. W., P. A. Kemme, Z. Mroz, M. Makinen, and A. K. Kies. 1995b. Effect of phytate, phytase and lactic acid on faecal digestibility of ash and some minerals in pigs. Manipulating Pig Production V:191.

46. Jongbloed, A. W., P. A. Kemme, and Z. Mroz. 1991. Effect of supplementary microbial phytase in diets for pigs on digestibility of P and phytic acid in different sections of the alimentary tract. J. Anim. Sci. 69(Suppl. 1):385.

47. Jongbloed, A. W., Z. Mroz, and P. A. Kemme. 1992. The effect of supplementary *Aspergillus niger* phytase in diets for pigs on concentration and apparent digestibility of dry matter, total phosphorus, and phytic acid in different sections of the alimentary tract. J. Anim. Sci. 70:1159.

48. Kemme, P. A., A. W. Jongbloed, Z. Mroz, and M. Makinen. 1995. Apparent ileal digestibility of protein and amino acids from a maize-soybean meal diet with or without extrinsic phytate and phytase in pigs. Abstract presented at the Int. Symp. on Nutr. Management of Food Animals to Enhance the Environment, June 4-7, Blacksburg, VA.

49. Kerr, B. J., and R. A. Easter. 1995. Effect of feeding reduced protein, amino acid supplemented diets on nitrogen and energy balance in grower pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 73:3000.

50. Kornegay, E. T. 1978a. Feeding value and digestibility of soybean hulls for swine. J. Anim. Sci. 47:1272.

51. Kornegay, E. T. 1978b. Protein digestibility of hydrolyzed hog hair meal for swine. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 3:323.

52. Kornegay, E. T. 1986. Calcium and phosphorus in swine nutrition. In Calcium and Phosphorus in Swine Nutrition. p 1. National Feed Ingredients Assoc., Des Moines, IA.

53. Kornegay, E. T. 1996. Nutritional, environmental and economical considerations for using phytase in pig and poultry diets. In Nutrient Management of Food Animals to Enhance and Protect the Environment. E. T. Kornegay (Ed.). p 277. CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, FL.

54. Kornegay, E. T. and B. Kite. 1983. Phosphorus in swine. VI. Utilization of nitrogen, calcium and performance of gravid gilts fed two dietary phosphorus levels for five parities. J. Anim. Sci. 57:1463.

55. Kornegay, E. T. and H. Qian. 1996. Replacement of inorganic phosphorus by microbial phytase for young pigs fed a corn soybean meal diet. Br. J. Nutr. 76:563.

56. Kornegay, E. T., M. R. Holland, K. E. Webb, Jr., K. P. Bovard, and J. D. Hedges. 1977. Nutrient characterization of swine fecal waste and utilization of these nutrients by swine. J. Anim. Sci. 44:608.

57. Kornegay, E. T., J. S. Radcliffe, and D. M. Denbow. 1996. Influence of Natuphos® Phytase on Calcium Bioavailability in Plant Ingredients and Development of Calcium Equivalency Values for Swine and Poultry. In Phytase in Animal Nutrition and Waste Management. M. B. Coelho and E. T. Kornegay (Eds.). p 419. BASF Corp., Mount Olive, NJ.

58. Lantzsch, H.-J. and W. Drochner. 1995. Efficacy of microbial phytase (A. Niger) on apparent absorption and retention of some minerals in breeding sows. Proc. 2nd European Symp. on Feed Enzymes. p 300. Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands.

59. Latimer, P., and A. Pointillart. 1993. Effects of three levels of dietary phosphorus (.4, .5, .6% P) on performance, carcass, traits, bone mineralization and excreted phosphorus of growing-finishing swine. In 25th French Swine Days Report. 25:52.

60. Lei, X. G., P. Ku, E. R. Miller, D. E. Ullrey, and M. T. Yokoyama. 1993. Supplemental microbial phytase improves bioavailability of dietary zinc to weanling pigs. J. Nutr. 123:1117.

61. Lenis, N. P. 1992. Digestible amino acids for pigs. Assessment of requirements on ileal digestible basis. Pig News and Information 13, 31N.

62. Lindemann, M. D., E. T. Kornegay, and R. J. Moore. 1986. Digestibility and feeding value of peanut hulls for swine. J. Anim. Sci. 62:412.

63. Liu, J., D. W. Bollinger, D. R. Ledoux, and T. L. Veum. 1996. Effects of dietary calcium concentrations on performance and bone characteristics of growing-finishing pigs fed low phosphorus corn-soybean meal diets supplemented with microbial phytase. J. Anim. Sci. 74(Suppl. 1):180. (Abs.).

64. Moore, R. J., E. T. Kornegay, and M. D. Lindemann. 1986. Effect of salinomycin on nutrient absorption and retention by growing pigs fed corn-soybean meal diets with or without oat hulls or wheat bran. Can. J. Anim. Sci. 66:257.

65. Mueller, J. P., J. P. Zublena, M. H. Poore, J. C. Barker, and J. T. Green. 1994. Managing pasture and hay fields receiving nutrients from anaerobic swine waste lagoons, N.C. Cooperative Ext. Service, AG-506.

66. Näsi, M. 1990. Microbial phytase supplementation for improving availability of plant phosphorus in the diet of the growing pig. J. Agric. Sci. Finl. 62:435.

67. Näsi, M. and E. Helander. 1994. Effects of microbial phytase supplementation and soaking of barley -soybean meal on availability of plant phosphorus for growing pigs. Sect. A. Anim. Sci. Acta Agric. Scand. 44:79.

68. Näsi, J. M., J. T. Piironen, and K. H. Partanen. 1995. Interaction between phytase and acid phosphatase activities in degradation of phytates of maize and barley based pig diets. Proc. 2nd European Symp. on Feed Enzymes. p 219. Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands.

69. NRC. 1988. Nutrient requirements of swine. (9th Rev. Ed.). National Research Council. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

70. Overfield, J. J., J. Krug, and R. Adkins. 1986. Swine Nutrient Requirement Survey. A report prepared for the Swine Committee of the AFIA Nutrition Council.

71. Pallauf, V. J., D. Hohler, and G. Rimbach. 1992a. Effect of microbial phytase supplementation to a maize-soya-diet on the apparent absorption on Mg, Fe, Cu, Mn and Zn and parameters of Zn-status in piglets. J. Anim. Physiol. Anim. Nutr. 68:1.

72. Pallauf, V. J., D. Holer, G. Rimbach, and H. Neusser. 1992b. Effect of microbial phytase

supplementation to a maize-soy-diet on the apparent absorption of phosphorus and calcium in piglets. J. Anim. Physiol. a. Anim. Nutr. 67:30.

73. Pallauf, J., G. Rimbach, S. Pippig, B. Schindler, and E. Most. 1994a. Effect of phytase supplementation to a phytate-rich diet based on wheat, barley and soya on the bioavailability of dietary phosphorus, calcium, magnesium, zinc and protein in piglets. Agribio. Res. 47:39.

74. Pallauf, J., G. Rimbach, S. Pippig, B. Schindler, D. Hohler and E. Most. 1994b. Dietary effect of phytogenic phytase and an addition of microbial phytase to a diet based on field beans, wheat, peas and barley on the utilization of phosphorus, calcium, magnesium, zinc and protein in piglets. Z. Ernahrungswiss 33:128.

75. Pierzynski, G. M., J. T. Sims, and G. F. Vance. 1994. Soils and Environmental Quality. Lewis Publishers, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

76. Qian, H., E. T. Kornegay, and D. E. Conner, Jr. 1996. Adverse effects of wide calcium:phosphorus ratios on supplemental phytase efficacy for weanling pigs fed two dietary phosphorus levels. J. Anim. Sci. 74:1288.

77. Radcliffe, J. S., E. T. Kornegay, and D. E. Conner, Jr. 1995. The effect of phytase on calcium release in weanling pigs fed corn-soybean meal diets. J. Anim. Sci. 73(Suppl. 1):173.

78. SCA. 1987. Feeding standards for Australian livestock. V. Pigs. Editorial and publishing unit, CSIRO, East Melbourne, Australia.

79. Sharpley, A. N. 1995. Dependence of runoff phosphorus on extractable soil phosphorus. J. Environ. Qual. 24:920.

80. Sharpley, A. N., S. C. Chapra, R. Wedepohl, J. T. Sims, T. C. Daniel, and K. R. Reddy. 1994. Managing agricultural phosphorus for protection of surface waters: Issues and options. J. Environ. Qual. 23:437.

81. Sharpley, A. N., T. C. Daniel, and D. R. Edwards. 1993. Phosphorus movement in the landscape. J. Prod. Agric. 6:492.

82. Shih, B.-L., and A.-L. Hsu. 1997. Effects of dietary phytase supplementation on the growth performance, bone mechanical properties and phosphorus excretion of finishing pigs. J. Taiwan Livestock Res. 30 (In press).

83. Simons, P.C.M., H.A.J. Versteegh, A. W. Jongbloed, P. A. Kemme, P. Slump, K. D. Bos, M.G.E. Wolters, R. F. Beudeker, and G. J. Verschoor. 1990. Improvement of phosphorus availability by microbial phytase in broilers and pigs. Br. J. Nutr. 64:525.

84. Sims, J. T. 1993. Environmental soil testing for phosphorus. J. Prod. Agric. 6: 501.

85. Spears, J. W. 1996. Optimizing mineral levels and sources for farm animals. In Nutrient Management of Food Animals to Enhance and Protect the Environment. E. T. Kornegay (Ed.). p 259. CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, FL.

86. Sweeten, J. M. 1992. Livestock and Poultry Waste Management: A National Overview. In National Livestock, Poultry and Aquaculture Waste Management. J. Blake, J. Donald, and W. Magette (Ed.). p 4. Amer. Soc. Agric. Eng., St. Joseph, MI.

87. Swinkels, J.W.G.M., E. T. Kornegay, and M.W.A. Verstegen. 1994. Biology of zinc and biological value of dietary organic zinc complexes and chelates. Nutr. Res. Rev. 7:129.

88. Tanksley, T. D., Jr., and D. A. Knabe. 1984. Ileal digestibilities of amino acids in pig feeds and their use in formulating diets. In Recent Advances in Animal Nutrition—1984. p 75. Butterworths, London, UK.

89. Van der Honing, Y., A. W. Jongbloed, and N. P. Lenis, 1993. Nutrition management to reduce environmental pollution by pigs. VII World Conf. on Anim. Prod., Edmonton, AB, Canada. (Abs.).

90. Van Horn, H. H. 1992. Achieving environmental balance with manure and cropping systems. Georgia Nutr. Conf. p 110. Athens, GA.

91. Verstegen, M. 1995. Strategies in the Netherlands for animal waste reduction management. In New Horizons in Animal Nutrition and Health. J. B. Longenecker and J. W. Spears (Eds.). p 79. The Institute of Nutrition, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC.

92. Veum, T. L. 1996a. Influence of high dietary calcium or calcium:phosphorus ratios on the effectiveness of microbial phytase for swine. In Phytase in Animal Nutrition and Waste Management. M. B. Coelho and E. T. Kornegay (Eds.). p 381. BASF Corp., Mount Olive, NJ.

93. Veum, T. L. 1996b. Use of microbial phytase in corn-soybean meal and grain sorghum-canola meal diets for growing-finishing swine. Phytase in Animal Nutrition and Waste Management. InM. B. Coehlo and E. T. Kornegay (Eds.). p 365. BASF Corp., Mount Olive, NJ.

94. Vipperman, P. E., E. R. Peo, and P. J. Cunningham. 1974. Effect of dietary calcium, phosphorus and nitrogen balance in swine. J. Anim. Sci. 38:758.

95. Walz, O. P., H. J. Ingelmann, and J. Pallauf. 1994. Digestibility and retention of protein and minerals during the fattening of pigs fed diets low in protein and phosphorus with supplementation of amino acids and phytase. In VI International Symposium on Digestive Physiology in Pigs. Bad Doberan, Proc., Vol. II:4.

96. Yi, Z., E. T. Kornegay, and D. M. Denbow. 1996a. Supplemental microbial phytase improves zinc utilization in broilers. Poultry Sci. 75: 540.

97. Yi, Z., E. T. Kornegay, and D. M. Denbow. 1996b. Effect of microbial phytase on nitrogen and amino acid digestibility and nitrogen retention of turkey poults fed corn-soybean diets. Poultry Sci. 75: 979.

98. Yi, Z., E. T. Kornegay, M. D. Lindemann, V. Ravindran, and J. H. Wilson. 1996c. Effectiveness of Natuphos® phytase in improving the bioavailabilities of phosphorus and other nutrients in soybean meal-based semipurified diets for young pigs. J. Anim. Sci. 74:1601.

99. Zhu, M., D. Bosch, and E. T. Kornegay. 1996. The potential impact of microbial phytase on poultry and swine manure disposal costs in the United States. II. Swine. Virginia Tech Anim. and Poultry Sci. Res. Rpt. 12:63.

Section L: Odor Control

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR ODOR CONTROL IN CONFINEMENT SWINE OPERATIONS

Hans Stein[1], Alvaro Garcia[2], Kent Tjardes[1], Charles Ullery[3], Stephen Pohl[3], and Christopher Schmit[4]

[1]Animal and Range Sciences Department, [2]Dairy Science Department,
[3]Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Department, and
[4] Civil and Environmental Engineering Department,
South Dakota State University, Brookings S.D.

Summary:

Odors coming off a swine facility are generated from three different sources: the unit itself, from the storage facility, or the land on which the manure is applied.

To reduce the total amount of odor generated from a swine facility, odor generation and emission by each of these three sources needs to be reduced. Within each area, several options for odor reduction are available. Practices that have been proven to be effective and that can be immediately implemented are listed in Table 1. Other options are being developed or tested. Research into these practices will reveal whether or not they can be successfully implemented in the future.

Table 1 is organized in four sections covering practices that:

1. reduce odor generation in barns,
2. reduce odor emission from facilities and storage units,
3. increase odor dispersion, and
4. reduce odor emission from manure application.

For each practice, advantages and disadvantages are listed. The effectiveness and the cost of implementing each practice is indicated using odor generation from a standard swine facility as a base line. This unit is assumed to be constructed using state-of-the-art recommendations including deep pits or an uncovered manure storage facility, curtain sidings or mechanical ventilation, and no dietary modifications to reduce odor generation.

To obtain an overall reduction in odors from a facility, reductions need to be made in odor generated by the unit itself, the storage facility, and from land application.

Some practices listed in Table 1 are best management practices (BMP). These are practices with well-documented beneficial effects on sustainability of a production system. Their implementation should be encouraged even without considering their potential for odor reduction.

The cost of each practice is indicated. A "low" cost is assumed to be less than $0.50 per GF pig produced ($1.25/Animal Unit); "moderate" is assumed to add $0.50-$1.50 per GF pig produced ($1.25-3.75/Animal Unit), and "high" is assumed to add more than $1.50 per GF pig produced ($3.75/Animal Unit) to total production costs, as compared to the base line unit.

Conclusions and Recommendations

A number of practices are available to reduce odor from swine facilities. A reduction in odor coming off a swine facility is achieved only if the odors emitted by the unit itself, from the storage facility, and from the land application of the manure are reduced.

At this time, the following practices are recommended:

1. The odor from the unit itself can be reduced by a combination of dietary practices and the installation of a biofilter.
2. The odor from the storage facility can be reduced by installing an effective lagoon cover. In larger units this may be combined with a manure separator and (or) a methane digester.
3. The odor from the land application of manure can be reduced by injecting the manure into the soil.

Research into odor reduction is ongoing, and many new technologies are being developed. As independent research using these technologies becomes available, some of these technologies may prove to be even more effective than the ones listed in the table. SDSU swine research being conducted at the Southeast Research Farm near Beresford has demonstrated that biofilters reduce odor emissions from confined buildings by 96%.

Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the USDA. Larry Tidemann, director of CES, associate dean, College of Agriculture & Biological Sciences, South Dakota State University, Brookings. South Dakota State University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and offers all benefits, services, education, and employment without regard for race, color, creed, religion, national origin, ancestry, citizenship, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or Vietnam Era veteran status. SZZ803-B: Printed at cost of $.16 each.

Table 1: Odor Reduction Practices for Swine Operations

Section 1: Reduce generation of odor						
Practice	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Effectiveness	Cost	Comments
a. Low protein diets	Diets are lowered 3-4% in CP compared to NRC rec. Crystalline AA are added to diets so that AA levels follows NRC rec	Avoid overfeeding CP. Fewer problems with enteric diseases in pigs. Reduced N in manure, reduced ammonia emission	Reduced consumption of byproducts and alternative ingredients	Moderate	Low. (Sometimes the cost of LP diets are actually lower than regular diets)	Cost offset by increased productivity and more efficient nutrient use. Should be considered a BMP
b. Low sulfur diets	Diets using no micro-minerals on sulfate form and no excess sulfur containing AA	Reduced production of H_2S	Some restrictions apply to the mineral sources that can be used	Moderate	Low	Should be considered a BMP
c. Phase feeding	Diets are changed frequently during the production phases to match the nutrient requirement of the pigs	Overfeeding and underfeeding with nutrients can be reduced	More diets are required on the farm	Low	Low	Should be considered a BMP
d. Precision diet formulation	Diets are formulated based on digestible contents of amino acids and minerals and the net energy content of the diets. Also, the ideal protein concept is used in diet formulation	Diets that more precisely match the requirement of the animals can be formulated. Reduction of excess nutrients in diets and thus in manure	Research is needed to establish digestible contents of nutrients in feed ingredients and the animals requirements for digestible nutrients	Low	Low	At least 3-5 years of research needed before concept can be implemented
e. Pelleting diets	All diets used in the operation are pelleted prior to use	Reduces dust generation and decreases amount of feed wasted in the manure pit	None	Low	Low ($10/ton for mixing, this cost offset by increased nutrient digestibility)	

Table 1. Odor reduction practices for swine operations (cont.)

Section 2: Decrease Emission of Odor						
Practice	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Effectiveness	Cost	Comments
a. Flush systems for manure removal	Removes manure frequently by flushing all the pits	Effective in reducing emission from pit	Increased labor, need for outside storage	Moderate	Moderate	
b. Pit systems w/ reduced manure surface	Sloped bottom of pits make sure manure surface is reduced	Reduces emission from pits	None	Moderate	Moderate	Usually combined with increased flushing
c. Oil spraying	Vegetable oil sprayed in facilities at regular intervals	Bound dust also odors present in the dust	More slicky surface	Moderate	Moderate	Reduces health risk for human workers in barns
d. Biofilters	Air exhausted through a biofilter made from organic material that captures the odors. Clean, odorless air is released.	Very effective. Simple to construct. Environmentally friendly	Building design. Aesthetics	High	Low to moderate	Odor reduced by 96% in SDSU research. Cannot be used with curtain-sided barns
e. Storage additives	Additives added to manure storage facility	Supposed to reduce odor generation	Not a proven technique	Low	High	Questionable technique
f. Rigid manure storage covers	Mechanical cover is applied to the manure storage unit	Very effective	Can be costly	High	High	
g. Flexible manure storage cover	Flexible material applied on top of storage facility. May be textile or plastic membrane or floating clay balls		Can cause problems when agitating manure, support structure may be needed	High	Moderate	Several different materials can be used
h. Biodegradable manure storage cover	Straw is applied on top of storage facilities	Inexpensive	Needs to be filled every three months. More difficult to agitate storage unit	Moderate	Low	Effectiveness highly dependent on how the cover is managed
i. Manure separators	Separates manure into a solid and a liquid fraction	Decreases odor generation from storage	Relatively expensive, only applicable to large operations	Moderate	High	More effective separators are available in Europe
k. Methane digesters	Treat waste with 3 to 10% total solids. Biogas methane production from manure	Manure treatment can decrease odor at application time. Generation of electricity can help pay for treatment costs	Costs: $250,000 O + M = $7,500/year Cost effectiveness dependent on contract with electrical company.	High	High	May be combined with manure separators

Table 1. Odor reduction practices for swine operations (cont.)

Section 3: Increase Dispersion of Odor						
Practice	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Effectiveness	Cost	Comments
a. Shelterbelts	Create a vegetation barrier for dust and odorous compounds emitted from the building exhaust	Cost. Environment. Aesthetics	Requires planning and time	Low	Low	
b. Windbreak walls	Solid or porous wall constructed 10 to 15 feet from the exhaust fans will cause dust to settle	Rapid implementation	Cost. Aesthetics	Low	Low to moderate	
c. Setback distances	Optimize distance between odor emission sources and urban areas.	Cost.	Not applicable for facilities currently in operation	High	Variable	Effectiveness can be calculated through the OFFSET model (Univ. of Minn.)

Section 4: Land Application of Manure						
Practice	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Effectiveness	Cost	Comments
a. Manure injection or incorporation	Manure injected directly into soil. Can be done in pasture or bare soil or into a growing crop	No emission of odors from manure when applied to soil	Takes more horsepower and more sophisticated equipment	Very high	Low	Should be considered a BMP

Section M: Waste Storage Pond Pumping Plan

SECTION M. MANAGEMENT OF WASTE STORAGE PONDS

Waste Storage ponds are an efficient and practical means to collect and store manure effluent from a confined livestock farm. A properly designed pond must store, at a minimum 180 days of manure effluent including a 25 year 24 hour storm event. Waste storage ponds should never be full and always have sufficient storage for the next precipitation event.

Effluent collected from the livestock farm contains various amounts of manure nutrients, bacteria, and other materials. Every livestock operation is unique when taking into account the amount and intensity of different rainfall events, and number and species of animals.

Livestock operators have difficulty in dealing with the collected wastewater when there are larger than normal amounts of runoff. Operators can find themselves faced with full waste storage ponds and often less than ideal conditions for land applying or otherwise utilizing the wastewater.

Producers who operate a facility with a waste storage pond must be ready to handle emergency situations when the pond may become full or near overflowing. Eliminating pond overflows is a critical factor in reducing pollutants from entering streams and other water bodies.

Following are important recommendations to implement when operating a facility with a waste storage pond:

- Foremost, routinely monitor the level of the pond to assure there is enough storage remaining (plus freeboard) to hold the designed volume of a 25 year 24 hour storm event. This must Pumpdown level should be marked with a permanent depth gauge in the pond. If wastewater is above this line, the operator normally must pump the pond down below this level within 14 pump-able days.

- Plan ahead and develop a pumping plan. Identify specific fields and equipment needs for the pumping plan.

- Consider using cropping practices that will expand the "window of opportunity" for land application during the growing season. Decide on field access alternatives during wet weather conditions.

- Review and follow the Operation & Maintenance (O & M) guidelines provided with your manure management system design and constructions plans.

- Contact the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (501-682-7890) within 24 hours concerning a wastewater discharge.

Plan for Pumping Waste Storage Ponds

Operator Name C&H Hog Farms **Date** 04/11/2018

County Newton **Pond ID or Legal Description** Waste Storage Pond 1 & 2

- **Method Selected for Land Application of Wastewater**

  _X_ Pipeline/Sprinkler System (Permanent): *Waste Storage Pond 2*
  _____ Big Gun Sprinkler (Temporary)
  _____ Drag Hose System
  _X_ Tank Wagon: *Waste Storage Pond 1 and 2*
  _____ Other (Explain)

- **Pre-Arranged Source of Application Equipment (List all necessary equipment and access to it).**

Type Equip.	Obtain Where
Pump	Proposed to Field 5-9
Pipe	Proposed to Field 5-9
Sprinkler	Proposed to Field 5-9
Vac Tanker	Fields 1-4 and 7-17

- **Fields Available for Land Application of Wastewater in an Emergency**

Legal Description	Landuse	Acres Available	Predom. Soil
Sec. 26, T15N, R20W	Grass	74.3	48

- **Holding Capacity of Ponds at Must Pumpdown Level** 2,145,227 **gallons**
  Bottom of 25-year, 24-hour storage level. Pond is to be pumped within 10 days below level.

- **Holding Capacity of Ponds at High Water Line** 3,112,473 **gallons**
  Top of 25-year, 24-hour storage level (bottom of freeboard)(Includes Concrete Pits).

- **Holding Capacity of Ponds between Freeboard and Must Pumpdown Elevation** 207,705 **gallons**
  Bottom of freeboard- Must Pumpdown Elevation.

- **Application Rates**

  The fertilizer value of wastewater in waste storage ponds is variable. Prior to land application, it is recommended to collect a representative sample from the pond and sent to a testing laboratory for analysis. If time does not permit waiting for test results, estimates of the nutrient content can be made from data previously collected at other facilities or from publications.

The land application rate should be calculated based on (1) the nutrient content of the wastewater, (2) current soil tests, (3) crop needs and (4) the water intake capacity (inches/hour) of the soil if an irrigation system is used.

For more information and/or assistance in calculating application rates, contact your local NRCS and Conservation District Office.

Section N: Record Keeping and Land Application Log Forms

SECTION N. LAND APPLICATION LOG FORMS

The following log forms are enclosed:

1. Manure Source Details
2. Annual Report Form For Permitted Confined Animal Facilities
3. Previous Manure Applications and Nitrogen Credits
4. Calculating Residual/Supplemental Nitrogen Amounts
5. Fertilizer Recommendations and Crop Requirements
6. Determining the Manure Application Rate
7. Animal Waste Land Application Record For Permitted Confined Animal Facilities

Recordkeeping

Keeping records plays a critical role in a manure management system. Records are essential to determine appropriate rates of manure to apply to the land while protecting surface and groundwater resources. It enables operators to make good annual and long-term decisions concerning efficient use of manure. Additionally, records serve to document compliance with regulations or voluntary adoption of best management practices.

Records should be maintained for five years or as otherwise instructed by specific federal and state laws, local county ordinances and/or program requirements.

At a minimum, track manure applications by collecting and keeping records of the following information:

- **Soil test results and recommendations for all fields receiving manure (sampled and tested prior to hauling manure).**
- **Manure test results.**
- **Identity of the fields hauled to (including acres spread on and where in the field).**
- **Calculated "planned" manure application rate per field.**
- **Calculated "actual" manure application rate per field.**
- **Method of manure application.**
- **Date(s) and time(s) of manure application.**

The following additional records are recommended if the goal is to implement a whole farm nutrient budget program:

- **Soil test results and recommendations for the remaining fields receiving nutrients from other sources (i.e. commercial fertilizer).**
- **Form/rates of other nutrient sources applied per field.**
- **Crop planting and harvest dates and yields per field.**

Soil testing on a whole farm basis provides fertility level information on all fields allowing operators to make decisions as to where manure nutrients can best be utilized.

The Manure Nitrogen and Phosphorus Application Worksheets provided with this plan serve as excellent recordkeeping tools to document test results and manure applications.

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

ANNUAL REPORT FORM FOR PERMITTED CONFINED ANIMAL FACILITIES

REPORTING PERIOD: _____

PERMITTEE NAME: _____ **PERMIT NUMBER:** _____

PHONE NUMBER: _____ **AFIN NUMBER:**

_____

FACILITY TYPE AND SIZE: _____
(ie., 200 Cow Dairy, 2,500 Swine Finishing, 80,000 Bird Layer Operation, etc.)

WASTE DISPOSAL SYSTEM CONSISTS OF:

_____
(ie., Holding Pond, Holding Pond & Settling Basin, Concrete Holding Tank, etc.)

WASTE APPLICATION METHOD: _____
(ie., Tank Spreader, Irrigation System, etc.)

NO. OF APPLICATION FIELDS: _____

TOTAL AVAILABLE ACREAGE: _____

WASTEWATER SAMPLE LOCATION: _____
(Lagoon During Pumping or Field During Application)

YOU MUST SUBMIT A COPY OF THE **WASTEWATER ANALYSIS** FOR EACH SAMPLE PROVIDED TO THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE OR A PRIVATE LAB. THE WASTEWATER ANALYSIS MUST INCLUDE: pH (su), TOTAL NITROGEN, AMMONIA NITROGEN, TOTAL POTASSIUM, TOTAL PHOSPHORUS, AND PERCENT SOLIDS.

IN ADDITION, YOU MUST SUBMIT A COPY OF THE **SOIL ANALYSIS** FOR EACH FIELD WITH THIS FORM. THE SOIL ANALYSIS MUST INCLUDE: pH (su), POTASSIUM (lbs/ac), PHOSPHORUS (lbs/ac), AND NITRATES (lbs/ac). AT LEAST ONE SOIL ANALYSIS SHOULD BE DONE FOR EACH 30 ACRE TRACT.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE TABLE ON THE BACK FOR THE LAND APPLICATION REPORT. YOU MUST SIGN AND DATE THIS REPORT AND SUBMIT IT TO THE DEPARTMENT PRIOR TO MAY 30th OF EACH YEAR. PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF THIS REPORT, THE SOIL ANALYSIS, AND THE WASTEWATER ANALYSIS FOR YOUR RECORD AT THE FACILITY.

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF LAW THAT I HAVE EXAMINED AND AM FAMILIAR WITH THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED HEREIN AND BASED ON MY INQUIRY OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS IMMEDIATELY RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING THE INFORMATION, I BELIEVE THE SUBMITTED INFORMATION IS TRUE, ACCURATE AND COMPLETE. I AM AWARE THAT THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT PENALTIES FOR SUBMITTING FALSE INFORMATION.
_____ _____ _____ OWNER OR OPERATOR (Please Print) SIGNATURE DATE

Mail complete annual report form and annual application report to:

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
Permits Branch, Water Division
5301 Northshore Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72118

ANNUAL ANIMAL WASTE LAND APPLICATION REPORT

PERMITTEE NAME: _____ **PERMIT NUMBER:** _____

Field Name or/and Number	Crop Type	Total* Area Applied (acres)	Total** Volume Applied (gallons)	Total*** Nitrogen (lbs/1000 gal.)	Calculated Nitrogen Applied (lbs/ac)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

* Total available area is the area where manure was applied during the reporting period (this data can be obtained from the management plan).
** Total volume applied is the total volume applied to the field during the whole reporting period (this data can be obtained from record sheet).
*** Total Nitrogen concentration (lbs/1000 gallons) can be obtained from the wastewater analysis sheet.

Column (6) = Nitrogen Applied (lbs/ac) = Column(4) X Column(5) ÷ Column (3) ÷ 1,334

NOTE: You may make additional copies of this table as needed.

Mail complete annual report form and annual application report to:
Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality
Permits Branch, Water Division
5301 Northshore Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72118

Previous manure applications and nitrogen credits.

Date / /

Field	Nitrogen credit from application before last season's crop				Nitrogen credit from application before crop 2 seasons ago				Previous Manure Credit (PMC)
	Manure N Analysis lb/ton or lb/1000 gal	Application Rate ton/a or 1000 gal/a	% Available (Year 2)	N Credit lb/a	Manure N Analysis lb/ton or lb/1000 gal	Application Rate ton/a or 1000 gal/a	% Available (Year 3)	N Credit lb/a	lb/a
CALCULATION/ REFERENCE:	AE-1189 SHEET 1, COL 1	AE-1189 SHEET 2, COL 4	TABLE 2	(1)x(2)x(3)/100	AE-1189 SHEET 1, COL 1	AE-1189 SHEET 2, COL 4	TABLE 2	(5)x(6)x(7)/100	(4)+(8)
COLUMN:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

Calculating residual/supplemental nutrient amounts

Date / /

Field	Actual Application Rate	Actual Manure Analysis			Actual Nutrient Application Rate			Difference			Years to Next Application	
		N	P2O5	K2O	N	P2O5	K2O	N	P2O5	K2O	P2O5	K2O
	ton/a or 1000 gal/a	lb/ton, or lb/1000 gal			lb/a			lb/a			lb/a	
CALCULATION/ REFERENCE:	AE-1189				(1)X(2)X SHEET 3, COL 7/100	(1)X(3)X SHEET 3, COL 8/100	(1)X(4)X SHEET 3, COL 9/100	(5)-SHEET 3, COL 1	(6)-SHEET 3, COL 2	(7)-SHEET 3, COL 3	(6)/SHEET 3, COL 2	(7)/SHEET 3, COL 3
COLUMN:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)

Fertilizer recommendations and crop requirements.

Date / /

Field	Crop	Target Yield	Nitrogen Requirement	Soil Test Nitrogen (STN)	Sampling Date Adjustment (SDA)	Previous Crop Credits (PCC)	Previous Manure Credit (PMC)	Nutrient Requirements		
								Net N	P2O5	K2O
		bu/a, ton/a or lb/a	lb/a	lb/a	lb/a	lb/a	lb/a	lb/a		
CALCULATION/ REFERENCE:			SF 882	SF 882	SF 882	SF 882	SHEET 1, COL 9	(3)-[(4)+(5)+6)+(7)]	SF 882 or TABLE 4	SF 882 or TABLE 4
COLUMN:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)

Determining the manure application rate.

Date / /

Field	Nutrient Requirement			Estimated Manure Analysis			% Availability			Nutrient Available			Target Manure Application Rate		
	N	P2O5	K2O	N	P2O5	K2O	N	P2O5	K2O	N	P2O5	K2O	N	P2O5	K2O
	lb/a			lb/ton, or lb/1000 gal			%			lb/ton, or lb/1000 gal			ton/a, or lb/1000 gal		
CALCULATION/ REFERENCE:	SHEET 2, COL. 8	SHEET 2, COL. 9	SHEET 2, COL. 10	AE-1189 SHEET 1, COL. 1	AE-1189 SHEET 1, COL. 4	AE-1189 SHEET 1, COL. 5	TABLE 2	TABLE 3	TABLE 3	(4)X(7) /100	(5)X(8) /100	(6)X(9) /100	(1)/(10)	(2)/(11)	(3)/(12)
COLUMN:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)

ANIMAL WASTE LAND APPLICATION RECORD
FOR PERMITTED CONFINED ANIMAL FACILITIES

PERMITTEE:_____ PERMIT NUMBER:_____

APPLICATION METHOD:_____

Field Name or/and Number	Date Applied	Crop Type	Area Applied (acres)	Volume Applied (gallons)

NOTE: Facility record; **DO NOT MAIL THIS**; Keep this record at the facility.
Make additional copies of this table as needed.

Appendix

ARKANSAS

NEWTON COUNTY





GENERAL NOTES

LEGEND

N

No.	Revision/Issue	Date

DeHaan, Grabs & Associates, LLC
Consulting Engineers
PO Box 522, Mandan, ND 58554
(701) 663-1116, FAX: (701) 667-1356
www.dgaengineering.com

C&H HOG FARMS

GESTATION-FARROWING FARM

SECTION 26, T 15 N, R 20 W
NEWTON COUNTY, AR

COUNTY LOCATION MAP

DATE: MAY 22, 2012	SHEET: C.3.1
SCALE: 1" = 1000'	
DRAWN BY: CAS	
CHECKED BY: DLD	

FILE NAME: 05 PROJECT FILES/SWINE/HENSON/CFILES/PLAN

MANURE HANDLING SYSTEM FLOW DIAGRAM



Arkansas Nutrient Managemnt

Planner:	Monica Hancock
Plan Description:	2018 C & H Starting Application

Beta Test Version for Use by Select Planners wor

of Nutrient Management Plans for the application of n
the litter production for the farm, estimates the P Inde
allocation of nutrients to the various receiving fields, a
worksheet is the result of an effort to develop a reliabl
developed by a multi-agency effort. However, no guar
improvement should be directed to Karl VanDevende
NRCS soils update.

Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - - - - - Manure Distribution Summary, Grouped by Appl Time, Source, Field - - -

Fields Shown		15					Annual Appl Totals						
							Dry			Liquid			Total
							ton			1000 gal			
Total Annual		Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Per Acre	Per Field	Appl PI	Appl PI
PI Value	N Balance (+/-)	(Column Shown Value)	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show	Show
		(Column Default Value)											
20	-22	H1								8.50	132.60	13	13
24	-22	H2								8.50	144.50	15	15
44	-22	H3								8.50	115.60	27	27
24	-22	H4								8.50	74.80	15	15
61	-106	H7								12.00	891.60	37	37
34	-41	H8								16.00	248.00	26	26
54	-89	H9								13.00	535.60	41	41
34	-41	H10								16.00	531.20	26	26
21	-22	H11								8.50	175.95	15	15
63	-73	H12								14.00	331.80	43	43
24	-154	H13								9.00	554.40	16	16
22	-154	H14								9.00	162.00	16	16
26	-22	H15								8.50	518.50	15	15
35	-22	H16								8.50	676.60	27	27
53	-41	H17								16.00	1419.20	42	42
											6512.35		

Farm Totals
Available
Surpluses/Deficits (+/-)