

Table 7 (cont.). C-Factor - Cover Management Factor (Cultivated Fields and Pasture Land).

Cover/Management	Remarks	C-Factor
Cotton Conservation Tillage Residue Not Removed	Planted in Rye Average yield 1000lbs/acre/year - 30 inch rows	0.050
Cotton No Till, Planted in last years cotton residue	Average yield 500lbs/acre/year - 30 inch rows	0.143
Cotton No Till, Planted in last years cotton residue	Average yield 500lbs/acre/year - 38 inch rows	0.177
Cotton No Till, Planted in last years cotton residue	Average yield 750lbs/acre/year - 30 inch rows	0.100
Cotton No Till, Planted in last years cotton residue	Average yield 750lbs/acre/year - 38 inch rows	0.137
Peanut Conventional Till Residue Not Removed	Average yield 2000lbs/acre/year - 36 inch rows	0.371
Peanut Conventional Till Residue Not Removed	Average yield 3000lbs/acre/year - 36 inch rows	0.281
Peanut Conventional Till Residue Not Removed	Average yield 4000lbs/acre/year - 36 inch rows	0.230
Peanut Conventional Till Residue Removed	Average yield 2000lbs/acre/year	0.534
Peanut Conventional Till Residue Removed	Average yield 3000lbs/acre/year	0.449
Peanut Conventional Till Residue Removed	Average yield 4000lbs/acre/year	0.436
Peanut Conservation Tillage Planted in Rye	Average yield 2000lbs/acre/year - Residue Removed	0.479
Peanut Conservation Tillage Planted in Rye	Average yield 3000lbs/acre/year - Residue Removed	0.362
Peanut Conservation Tillage Planted in Rye	Average yield 4000lbs/acre/year - Residue Removed	0.269
Peanut No Till, Residue Not Removed	Average yield 3000lbs/acre/year	0.084
Peanut No Till	Average yield 3000lbs/acre/year - Residue Removed	0.154
Peanut No Till Planted in Rye	Average yield 3000lbs/acre/year - Residue Removed	0.089
Ryegrass, grazed		0.273
Rye, grazed	2800lbs/acre Residue Remaining	0.113
Rye, not grazed	4200lbs/acre Residue Remaining	0.080
Soybeans	Average yield 35 bushels/acre/year	0.355
Watermelon		0.320
Watermelon	With good summer weed or grass cover	0.173
Watermelon	Followed by rye, not grazed	0.269
Weed/Grass, idle	With good summer weed/grass cover	0.079
Weed/Grass, idle	With good summer and winter weed/grass cover	0.035
Weed/Grass, idle	With good winter weed/grass cover	0.245

Table 8. C-Factor - Cover Management Factor for Groves/Orchards (citrus, blueberries, etc.) Rangeland, Disturbed Forest Land , and Long-Term Hay Land, and Idle Land.

Vegetation Canopy Type			Percentage Surface Contact of Ground Cover					
Type and Height of Canopy	Canopy Cover ^a	Type ^b	0	20	40	60	80	>95
No appreciable canopy		G	.450	.200	.100	.013	.013	.003
		W	.450	.240	.150	.090	.043	.011
Tall weeds/short brush ^c	25	G	.360	.170	.090	.038	.012	.003
		W	.360	.200	.130	.082	.041	.011
	50	G	.260	.130	.070	.035	.012	.003
		W	.260	.160	.110	.075	.039	.011
	75	G	.170	.100	.060	.031	.011	.003
		W	.170	.120	.090	.067	.038	.011
Brush or bushes ^d	25	G	.400	.180	.090	.040	.013	.003
		W	.400	.220	.140	.085	.042	.011
	50	G	.340	.160	.085	.038	.012	.003
		W	.340	.190	.130	.081	.041	.011
	75	G	.280	.140	.080	.036	.012	.003
		W	.280	.170	.120	.077	.040	.011
Trees ^e	25	G	.420	.190	.100	.041	.013	.003
		W	.420	.230	.140	.087	.042	.011
	50	G	.390	.180	.090	.040	.013	.003
		W	.390	.210	.140	.085	.042	.011
	75	G	.360	.170	.090	.039	.012	.003
		W	.360	.200	.130	.083	.041	.011

^a Percent of total surface area hidden from view by canopy.
^b G = Surface cover is grass, grasslike plants, and/or decaying litter at least 2 inches thick.
W = Surface cover is broadleaf herbaceous plants and/or decaying litter less than 2 inches thick.
^c Average height that water drops from canopy in autumn is less than 3 feet.
^d Average height that water drops from canopy in autumn is 3 to 12 feet.
^e Average height that water drops from canopy in autumn is more than 12 feet.

C-Factors for Dual Cropping Systems

The C-factor for dual cropping systems is determined by averaging the individual C-Factors. For example, bahiagrass (6 years, grazed) followed by ryegrass, grazed would have a C-Factor calculated as follows:

C-Factor for bahiagrass, 6 years grazed 0.047 (from Table 7) plus C-Factor for ryegrass, grazed 0.273 (from Table 7) divided by 2 equals a C-Factor of 0.160 .

P is the support practice factor. **P** is the ratio of soil loss with a conservation support practice (contour cropping, contour strip cropping, or terracing) to soil loss with straight-row farming up and down the slope. P-factors for these conservation support practices have been computed and are listed in Tables 9, Table 10, and Table 11).

The methodology provided herein to calculate P-Factor is a simplified version. A more thorough methodology is explained in Chapter 6, Florida Agronomy Field Handbook, NRCS.

Table 9. P-Factors for Up and Down Hill Cropping and Contour Cropping.

Land Slope Percent	Up and Down Hill Farming P-Factor	Contour Farming P-Factor
1.1 to 2	1.0	0.60
2.1 to 7	1.0	0.50
7.1 to 12	1.0	0.60
12.1 to 18	1.0	0.80
18.1 to 24	1.0	0.90

Table 10. P-Factors for Contour Strip Cropping.

Land Slope Percent	P-Factor ^a	P-Factor ^b	P-Factor ^c	Contour Strip Width (feet) ^d	Maximum Slope Length (feet) ^e
1.0 to 2.5	0.30	0.45	0.60	130	800
2.6 to 5.5	0.25	0.38	0.50	100	600
5.6 to 8.5	0.25	0.38	0.50	100	400
8.6 to 12.5	0.30	0.45	0.60	80	240
12.6 to 16.5	0.35	0.52	0.70	80	160
16.5 to 20.5	0.40	0.60	0.80	60	120
21.5 to 25	0.45	0.68	0.90	50	100

^a For 4-year rotation of row crop, small grain with grass seeding, and 2 years of grass. A second row crop can replace the small grain if grass is established following harvest.

^b For 4-year rotation of 2 years of row crops, 1 year of winter grain with grass seeding, and 1 year of grass.

^c For alternative strips of row crop and small grain.

^d Adjust strip width limits, generally downward, to accommodate widths of equipment.

^e Length limits may be increased by 10 percent if residue cover after crop planting will regularly exceed 50 percent.

Table 11. P-Factors for Terraces.

Horizontal Interval (feet)	Closed Outlet ^a	Open Outlets with Percent Channel Grade Indicated ^b		
	P-Factor	P-Factor for 0.1-0.3	P-Factor for 0.4-0.7	P-Factor for >0.7
<110	0.50	0.60	0.70	1.0
111-140	0.60	0.70	0.80	1.0
141-180	0.70	0.80	0.90	1.0
181-225	0.80	0.80	0.90	1.0
226-300	0.90	0.90	1.0	1.0
>300	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

^a P-Factors for closed outlet terraces also apply to terraces with underground outlets and to level terraces with open outlets.

^b The channel grade is measured on the 300 feet of terrace or the 1/3 of total terrace length closest to the outlet, whichever is less.

Possible phosphorus transport rating values for soil erosion are (Part A - Table 1):

0 for fields with no surface outlet (such as for karst areas in the Suwannee River watershed).

1 for fields with a calculated soil loss (A) of less than 5 tons/acre/year.

2 for fields with a calculated soil loss (A) of between 5 and 10 tons/acre/year.

4 for fields with a calculated soil loss (A) of between 10 and 15 tons/acre/year.

8 for fields with a calculated soil loss (A) of more than 15 tons/acre/year.

Soil Erosion Calculation Example

Situation: An area in the southeastern portion of the county has the following conditions:

Soil: From soil survey the soil is map unit 29B (Lochloosa fine sand, 2-5 percent slopes). The soil was verified on-site as being Lochloosa fine sand, on a 2 percent slope with a slope length of 75 feet. The field is a bahiagrass pasture planted every 6 years.

$$A = R * K * LS * C * P$$

R = 440 (for all of Alachua County)

K = 0.10 (from Table 13)

LS = 0.25 (from Table 4)

C = 0.047 (from Table 7)

P = 1.0 (from Table 9; field is not contour cropped, contour strip cropped, or terraced)

A = 440 * 0.10 * 0.25 * 0.047 * 1.0

A = 0.5 tons/acre/year

The resulting Soil Erosion value assigned to the Phosphorus Transport Rating – Part A (Table 1) would be 1 (<5T/A), the most common result obtained in Alachua County.

Runoff Potential

Usage of the following runoff potential criteria is based on a minimum of 10 observations (soil borings) per spray field/application area unless the number of borings identify the site as a problem area or a uniform area. At least one observation is to be made in each of the landforms present. Examples of landforms are flats, flatwoods, depressions, terraces, rises, knolls, hills, hillsides, sideslopes, toeslopes, footslopes, etc. If there is no surface outlet for the field in consideration, the rating is Very Low (**0**) for Runoff Potential.

The NRCS Hydrologic Soil Groups, slope, and the presence or absence of artificial drainage are used to evaluate runoff potentials.

Runoff Potential Rating Criteria - Part A (see Table 1)

Very Low (0):

Soils in Hydrologic Soil Group A with $\geq 75\%$ ground cover **and slopes of 8% or less.**

or:

any Hydrologic Soil Group with no surface outlet.

Low (1):

Soils in Hydrologic Soil Groups A with $< 75\%$ ground cover with surface outlet and A/D (with effective drainage depth of greater than 48") **and slopes of 8% or less** (Effective drainage is water control that is designed and maintained according to NRCS standards that will perform the desired water control.)

Medium (2):

Soils in Hydrologic Group A and A/D (with effective drainage depth of 37" to 48") **and slopes of more than 8%.**

or:

Soils in Hydrologic Groups B and A/D or B/D (with effective drainage depth of 37" to 48") **and slopes of 5% or less.**

High (4):

Soils in Hydrologic Group B and B/D (with effective drainage depth of 20" to 36") **and slopes of more than 5% up to and including 8%.**

or:

Soils in Hydrologic Groups C and A/D, B/D or C/D (with effective drainage depth of 20" to 36") **and slopes of 5% or less.**

Very High (8):

Soils in Hydrologic Group B and B/D (with effective drainage depth of 37" to 48") **and slopes of more than 8%.**

or:

Soils in Hydrologic Groups C and C/D (with effective drainage depth of 20" to 36") **and slopes of more than 5%.**

or:

Soils in Hydrologic Groups D and A/D, B/D, and C/D in undrained condition.

Runoff Potentials are presented in Table 13 based on the above criteria and the definitions of the four hydrologic soil groups below. These are potentials to be used in conjunction with the soil survey of Alachua County (Thomas, et al. 1985). Potentials presented are interpretations and are not factual data. As with all interpretations, **runoff potentials should be confirmed by on-site investigations. Slope and hydrologic group should be determined on-site.**

Group A: Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well-drained to excessively-drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B: Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well-drained or well-drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C: Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D: Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink/swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

Artificial Drainage

Presence of artificial drainage can change the runoff potential of a soil. Drained Runoff Potentials in Table 13 have been assigned to those soils deemed drainable by NRCS. Drained Runoff Potentials presented are based on NRCS “Technical Release No. 55-Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds, Amendment FL3” (Table 12).

Table 12. Reclassification of Runoff Potential and Hydrologic Group Based on Drainage.

Effective Drainage Depth (Inches) ^a	Drained Runoff Potential	Drained Hydrologic Group
Less than 20	Very High	D
20-36	High	C
37-48	Medium	B
Greater than 48	Low	A

^a Effective drainage is defined as having good surface drainage with a designed subsurface drainage system properly installed and maintained with a water removal rate of at least 0.5 inches/day. **Rarely have agricultural fields in Alachua County been effectively drained to a depth of more than 24 inches.**

Drained Runoff Potentials in Table 13 are based on the maximum effective drainage depth expected for each soil. Actual effective drainage may be less than the maximum. For example, Pomona (Table 13--map unit 14) has a drained runoff potential of Medium. This rating is based on a maximum effective drainage depth of 37 to 48 inches. If field conditions indicate a site had been effectively drained to a depth of only 24 inches, then the on-site runoff potential would be High (Table 12) and the resulting Phosphorus Transport Rating – Part A value for runoff would be 4 (Table 1).

Leaching Potential

Usage of the following leaching potential criteria is based on a minimum of 5 observations (e.g. soil borings) per 40 acres of application area unless the number of borings identify the site as a problem area or a uniform area. Ground penetrating radar (GPR) should be used for the assessment of all Karst areas. At

least one observation is to be made in each landform present.

Presence or absence of a loamy/clayey layer and thicknesses of sandy layers, and presence or absence of coated sand are used to evaluate leaching potentials.

Leaching Potential Rating Criteria – Part A (see Table 1)

Very Low (0):

At least 80 percent of observations have a loamy or clayey layer at least 25 cm (10 inches) thick starting within 50 cm (20 inches). Typically, these soils are Typic Paleudults.

Low (1):

At least 80 percent of observations have a loamy or clayey layer at least 25 cm (10 inches) thick starting within 200 cm (80 inches). Typically, these soils are Arenic and Grossarenic Paleudults.

Medium (2):

At least 80 percent of observations have a loamy or clayey layer at least 25 cm (10 inches) thick starting at a depth below 200 cm (80 inches) but above seasonal high saturation **and** sand grains in the E and Bw horizons have coatings (chroma ≥ 3) to a depth of at least 100 cm (40 inches); or at least 80 percent of observations have no loamy or clayey layer at least 25 cm (10") thick, but have a layer at least 200 cm (80") thick with coated sand grains (chroma equal to or greater than 3). The entire 200 cm (80") layer must be above seasonal high saturation.

High (4):

At least 20 percent of observations have no loamy or clayey layer,(or the loamy or clayey layer is less than 25 cm (10 inches) thick) **and** the combined thickness of layers with coated sand grains (chroma ≥ 3 in the E, Bw, and C horizons and any chroma in the Bh horizons) is more than 50 cm (20 inches) and less than 200 cm (80 inches).

Very High (8):

At least 20 percent of observations have no loamy or clayey layer (or the layer is less than 25 cm (10 inches) thick **and** the combined thickness of layers with coated sand grains (chroma ≥ 3 in the E, Bw, and C horizons and any chroma in the Bh horizons) is equal to or less than 50 cm (20 inches).

Leaching Potentials are presented in Table 13 based on the above criteria. These are potentials to be used in conjunction with the soil survey of Alachua County (Thomas, et al. 1985). Potentials presented are interpretations, and are not factual data. As with all interpretations, **leaching potentials should be confirmed by on-site investigations.**

The rating of Medium Leaching Potential may be unique to Florida. This rating is based on deeper observation of soils that would normally be rated as having a High or Very High Leaching Potential. The rating of Medium Leaching Potential is given to soils with a significant loamy/clayey layer below the normal (2m or 80 inches) soil classification depth. Use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) and/or geological investigations is needed to rate a site as having a Medium Leaching Potential and the depth to the loamy/clayey layer must be **above** the seasonal high saturation (water table).

Sinkholes occur where calcareous limestone below the land surface has been naturally dissolved by circulating ground water. A sinkhole forms when soil or weakened rock falls into underlying cavernous limestone. The sinkhole depth to width ratio tends to relate to soil slope stability-- typically the width is 5 times the depth. Alachua County has areas considered to be high risk for sinkhole development. In these areas the GPR will be used to determine the leaching potential.

Phosphorus Runoff and Leaching Potentials Ratings for Florida Soil Survey Map Units

The runoff and leaching potentials (Table 13) were created by comparing estimated soil properties found in the soil survey of Alachua County (Thomas, et al. 1985) with the above criteria. The potentials presented herein are interpretations, and not factual data. As with all interpretations based on information in a published soil survey or other sources of estimated soil properties, **phosphorus runoff and leaching potentials should be confirmed by on-site investigations.** However, a soil survey is an excellent place to initiate off-site investigation before making on-site determinations. For information on how to use a soil survey, see Circular 959 Soil Ratings for Crop Production and Water Quality Protection (Brown, et al. 1991). However, note that phosphorus runoff and leaching potentials were derived from criteria that are different from the criteria used to derive the pesticide runoff and leaching potentials.

Table 13. Runoff, Leaching Potentials and K-Factors for Alachua County Soils.

Map Unit ^a	Seq. No. ^b	Soil Name	Undrained Runoff Potential	Undrained and Drained Leaching Potential	Drained Runoff Potential	K-Factor
2B (2)	1	Candler	Low ^c	High		0.10
2C (68)	1	Candler	Low ^c	High		0.10
3B (3)	1	Arrendondo	Low ^c	Low		0.10
3C (69)	1	Arrendondo	Low ^c	Low		0.10
4B (4)	1	Arrendondo	Low ^c	Low		0.10
4B (4)	2	Urban Land	Very High	Variable		No Value
5B (5)	1	Fort Meade	Low ^c	High		0.15
6B (6)	1	Apopka	Low ^c	Low		0.10
6C (70)	1	Apopka	Low ^c	Low		0.10
7B (7)	1	Kanapaha	Very High	Low	Medium	0.10
8B (8)	1	Millhopper	Low ^c	Low		0.10
8C (71)	1	Millhopper	Low ^c	Low		0.10
9B (9)	1	Millhopper	Low ^c	Low		0.10
9B (9)	2	Urban Land	Very High	Variable		No Value
11 (11)	1	Riviera	Very High	Low	High	0.10
12 (12)	1	Pelham	Very High	Low	High	0.10
14 (14)	1	Pomona	Very High	Low	Medium	0.10
15 (15)	1	Pompano	Very High	Very High	Low ^c	0.10
16 (16)	1	Surrency	Very High	Low		0.10
17 (17)	1	Wauchula	Very High	Low	High	0.10
18 (18)	1	Wauchula	Very High	Low	High	0.10
18 (18)	2	Urban Land	Very High	Variable		No Value

Table 13(cont.). Runoff, Leaching Potentials and K-Factors for Alachua County Soils.

Map Unit ^a	Seq. No. ^b	Soil Name	Undrained Runoff Potential	Undrained and Drained Leaching Potential	Drained Runoff Potential	K-Factor
19 (19)	1	Monteocha	Very High	Low	Medium	0.15
20 (20)	1	Tavares	Low ^c	High		0.10
21 (21)	1	Newnan	High	High		0.10
22 (22)	1	Floridana	Very High	Low	High	0.10
23 (23)	1	Mulat	Very High	Low	High	0.10
24 (24)	1	Pomona	Very High	Low	Medium	0.10
26 (26)	1	Samsula	Very High	Very High	Medium	0.02
27 (27)	1	Urban Land	Very High	Variable		No Value
28 (28)	1	Chipley	High	High		0.10
29B (29)	1	Lochloosa	High	Low		0.10
29C (72)	1	Lochloosa	Very High	Low		0.10
30B (30)	1	Kendrick	Low ^c	Low		0.10
30C (73)	1	Kendrick	Low ^c	Low		0.10
31A (31)	1	Blichton	Very High	Low	High	0.15
31B (74)	1	Blichton	Very High	Low	High	0.15
31C (75)	1	Blichton	Very High	Low	Very High	0.15
32B (32)	1	Bivans	Very High	Very Low	Very High	0.10
32C (76)	1	Bivans	Very High	Low	Very High	0.10
32D (77)	1	Bivans	Very High	Low	Very High	0.10
33B	1	Norfolk	Medium	Very Low		0.17
33C (78)	1	Norfolk	High	Low		0.17
34	1	Placid	Very High	Very High	Low ^c	0.10
35B (35)	1	Gainesville	Low ^c	High		0.15
35C (79)	1	Gainesville	Low ^c	High		0.15
36 (36)	1	Arents	Variable	Variable		0.17
37 (37)	1	Zolfo	High	High		0.10
38 (38)	1	Pits	Variable	Variable		Variable ^f
38 (38)	2	Dumps	Variable	Variable		Variable ^f
39B (39)	1	Bonneau	Medium	Low		0.15
41B (41)	1	Pedro	High	Very High ^d		0.10
42B (42)	1	Pedro	High	Very High ^d		0.10
42B (42)	2	Jonesville	Medium	Very High ^e		0.10
44B (44)	1	Blichton	Very High	Low	High	0.15
44B (44)	2	Urban Land	Very High	Variable		No Value
45 (45)	1	Urban Land	Very High	Variable		Variable ^f
45 (45)	2	Millhopper	Low ^c	Low		0.10
46B (46)	1	Jonesville	Medium	Very High ^e		0.10
46B (46)	2	Cadillac	Low ^c	Low		0.10
46B (46)	3	Bonneau	Low ^c	Low		0.10

Table 13(cont.). Runoff, Leaching Potentials and K-Factors for Alachua County Soils.

Map Unit ^a	Seq. No. ^b	Soil Name	Undrained Runoff Potential	Undrained and Drained Leaching Potential	Drained Runoff Potential	K-Factor
47B (47)	1	Candler	Low ^c	High		0.10
47B (47)	2	Apopka	Low ^c	Low		0.10
48 (48)	1	Myakka	Very High	High ^e	Medium	0.10
49A (49)	1	Lochloosa	High	Low		0.10
50 (50)	1	Sparr	High	Low		0.10
51 (51)	1	Plummer	Very High	Low	Medium	0.10
52 (52)	1	Ledwith	Very High	Very Low	Medium	0.02
53 (53)	1	Shenks	Very High	Low	High	0.02
54 (54)	1	Emeralda	Very High	Very Low	Very High	0.15
55B (55)	1	Lake	Low ^c	High		0.10
56 (56)	1	Wauberg	Very High	Low	High	0.15
57B (57)	1	Micanopy	High	Very Low		0.15
58B (58)	1	Lake	Low ^c	High		0.10
59 (59)	1	Pottsburg	Very High	High	Medium	0.10
60 (60)	1	Udorthents	Variable	Variable		Variable ^f
61 (61)	1	Oleno	Very High	Very Low		0.37
62C (62)	1	Boardman	Very High	Low	Very High	0.15
63 (63)	1	Terra Ceia	Very High	Very High	Medium	0.02
64 (64)	1	Okeechobee	Very High	Very High	Medium	0.02
65 (65)	1	Martel	Very High	Very Low		0.24
67C (67)	1	Wacahoota	Very High	Very Low	Very High	0.15
(80)	1	Mascotte	Very High	Low		0.10
(80)	2	Wesconnett	Very High	High		0.10
(80)	3	Surrency	Very High	Low		0.10
(81)	1	Stake	Very High	Low	Medium	0.10
(82)	1	Plummer	Very High	Low		0.10
(82)	2	Mascotte	Very High	Low		0.10
(83)	1	Pickney	Very High	Very High		0.10
(84)	1	Ocilla	High	Low		0.10
(84)	2	Alapaha	Very High	Low		0.10
(84)	3	Mandarin	High	High ^e		0.10
(85)	1	Pamlico	Very High	Very High		0.10

^a The first map unit symbol is for those map units on the published soil survey (Thomas, et. al. 1985). The map unit symbol in parentheses is for those map units on the digital soil survey. Information concerning digital soil surveys is available at any NRCS office.

^b Seq. No. indicates a particular soil series name among one or more names constituting a map unit name.

^c Rate Very Low where percent ground cover is greater than 75%.

^d Rate Very High if combined thickness of layers with chroma 3 or more and Bh horizons is less than 20 inches.

^e Rate Low if thickness of loamy/clayey layers is more than 10 inches.

^f K-factors to be used: muck = 0.02, mucky sand = 0.05, sand = 0.10, loamy sand = 0.15, sandy loam = 0.20, sandy clay loam = 0.24, and clay = 0.37

Potential to Reach Water Body

This parameter is used to address the potential for runoff to reach a water body. If there is no direct discharge from the edge of a field, the potential to affect a water body is considered to be “very low.” If the P concentration of the runoff can be attenuated by flow through a wetland, buffer strip or overland treatment area, the potential is considered “low.” If there is ditch drainage or direct discharge to a water body, the index value is increased to “medium.” When there is potential for direct discharge to a lake, sinkhole, or natural stream the potential for water quality degradation by P is enhanced and the index rating is increased to “high.”

Potential to Reach Water Body Rating Criteria (see Table 1)

Very Low (0):

No direct discharge from the edge of the field.

Low (1):

Discharge through wetlands, buffer area (refer to table below for buffer width), storm water detention, or overland treatment.

Medium (2):

No buffer, ditch drainage to or direct discharge to a water body.

High (4):

Direct discharges to a lake, sinkhole, or natural stream.

Non-Application Buffer Widths ¹		
Object, Site	Situation	Base Buffer Width from Object, Site (ft.)
Well, potable	Located up-slope of application site	150
Well, potable	Located down-slope of application site provided conditions warrant application	300
Waterbody, Stream ^{2/} , sinkhole or wetland	Good vegetation ^{3/} . Add 2 feet for each 1% slope for slopes up to 8%.	50 (+)
Waterbody, Stream ^{2/} , sinkhole or wetland	Poor vegetative cover or Predominant slope > 8% ^{3/}	100
Public Road – roadside ditch	Irrigated wastewater or solids applied with spreader	30

1/ Research has shown that forested or forest/grass buffers are more effective at removing phosphorus. Grass buffers are more effective at removing nitrogen. Every effort should be made to reduce phosphorus inputs at their sources. If phosphorus is managed responsibly on-site, buffers can store significant amounts of the excess; but if phosphorus is uncontrolled buffers can quickly become saturated and over whelmed. Even with their limits, buffers still perform a valuable service by displacing phosphorus-producing activities away from streams and regulating the flow of phosphorus. Taken in part from “A Review Of The Scientific Literature On Riparian Buffer Width, Extent And Vegetation”, Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia.

2/ Waterbody includes pond, lake, or open sinkhole. Open sinks include paleo sinks without a confining layer within 80 inches of the surface. Stream includes both perennial and intermittent streams and canals.

3/ Good vegetation refers to a well-managed, dense stand that is not overgrazed.

Phosphorus Transport Potential Due to Phosphorus Source Management - Part B (Table 2)

Phosphorus transport potential due to phosphorus source management is as follows:

- Fertility Index Value
- P Application Source and Rate
- Application Method
- Waste Water Application

Criteria

Fertility Index Value:

Existing soil P levels are included in the P Index and identified as the “fertility index”. The “fertility index” is defined as Mehlich-3 extractable P, of a 0-15 cm (0-6 inches) depth soil sample, in ppm (parts per million) multiplied by 2 to convert to pounds per acre. The 0.025 multiplication factor was selected to provide a value range similar to those used for other parameters in the P Index.

Obtain soil samples by taking 15 to 20 small cores (for areas up to 40 acres) at random over the entire area to a depth of about 6 inches. Place the 15 to 20 plugs in a container, mix them thoroughly, and send approximately one pint of the mixed sample to the UF/IFAS Extension Soil Testing Laboratory (ESTL) or other qualified laboratory for analysis.

P Application Source and Rate:

The multiplication factors for the application of P vary based on the source (fertilizer, manure, compost, biosolids, or waste water). Fertilizer, manure, and compost have the multiplier 0.05. For biosolids the multiplier is lower (0.015) because of evidence that the Fe and Al content of biosolids will decrease the P availability in biosolids-amended soils. In contrast, P in water from municipal and lagoon effluents is mostly in a soluble form and therefore the multiplier is higher (0.10).

Application Method:

The application method is not a consideration for sites that have No Surface Outlet or where solids are incorporated immediately after application or injected (value 0). For all other sites, effluent applied via irrigation are typically applied frequently (weekly, bi-weekly) and in small amounts or where solids are incorporated within one day of application; therefore, the potential for P loss is low (value 2). In contrast, solids (fertilizers, compost, biosolids, manures) surface-applied and not incorporated would have a higher potential for loss, particularly through surface runoff (value 6). Incorporated solids within 5 days of application have a medium potential for loss (value 4).

Waste Water Application Volume:

Excessive volumes of water may exacerbate movement of P via downward or lateral leaching, depending on the landscape. The 0.20 multiplication factor was selected to provide a value range similar to those used for other parameters in the P Index.

RESULTING P INDEX

The P Index is obtained by multiplying the site and transport characteristics totals – Part A (Table 1) by the phosphorus source totals – Part B (Table 2). The results are interpreted according to guidelines in Table 3.

On sites with a LOW or MEDIUM vulnerability rating, it is possible to use a nitrogen-based budget to determine application rates. On sites with a HIGH or VERY HIGH vulnerability rating, it is necessary to use a phosphorus-based budget to determine application rates.

Assessing the P Index Results

The numerical result of the P Index has no absolute value, but is immediately translated into a qualitative rating (LOW, MEDIUM, HIGH, or VERY HIGH). For each qualitative rating a description is given for the level of concern that each specifically assessed field has for P loss potential (Table 3). Some general guidance is given for each qualitative level as to the intensity and type of remedial action or mitigation that would be necessary to reduce P loss risk.

Conservation Planning Notes

Since output from the P Index includes information that is specific to each of the site and transport characteristics – Part A (Table 1) and phosphorus source management – Part B (Table 2), the conservation planner can identify which characteristics/management have the greatest influence in determining the final vulnerability rating and may be targeted for remedial action. Table 14 may be used to record notes to explain, clarify, and/or define site characteristics and source management used to evaluate a site. Each factor can be revisited and planning changes made, thereby changing the resulting P Index. For example, terraces can be installed, thereby lowering soil erosion and the final P Index. Similarly, the P Index can be lowered by reducing the planned P application rate.

Table 14. Conservation Planning Notes.

Client Name:	County:	Date:
Planner:	Field(s):	Crop:
Site and Transport Characteristics	Remarks	
Soil Erosion		
Runoff Potential		
Leaching Potential		
Potential to Reach Water Body		
Phosphorus Source Management		
Fertility Index Value		
P Application Source and Rate		
P Application Method		
Waste Water Application		

GLOSSARY (as used in the P Index the following definitions apply)

No Surface Outlet – The combination of slope and permeability of the application site that will not discharge surface flow from that site in a 2 year – 24 hour rainfall event.

(This level of evaluating runoff is not intended to require calculation for the rainfall events but is intended to evaluate those sites that do not have external surface flows during most years. Where these sites occur, additional comments may need to be recorded on the back of form FL-CPA-41)

Compost – animal wastes and plant debris that has gone through the composting process.

Biosolids – Residuals, domestic wastewater residuals and/or septage as defined in Chapter 62-640 Florida Administrative Code. Biosolids include co-compost with a minimum of 50% biosolids.

Landform - Any physical, recognizable form or feature of the earth's surface, having a characteristic shape and produced by natural causes.

Examples of individual landforms and their definitions are:

Karst - Topography with sinkholes, caves, and underground drainage that is formed in limestone, gypsum, or other rocks by dissolution, and that is characterized by sinkholes, caves, and underground drainage.

Knoll - A small, low, rounded hill rising above adjacent landforms.

Subsurface Drainage – Lowering of the water table in order to improve vegetative growth, remove surface runoff from wet areas, or relieve artesian pressure. Subsurface drainage can be achieved by either using drainage tile or drainage ditches, typically spaced at regular intervals.

REFERENCES

Brown, R.B., A.G. Hornsby, and G.W. Hurt. 1991. Soil ratings for crop production and water quality protection. Circular 959. Florida Cooperative Extension Service, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Florida Ecological Sciences Staff. 1999. Florida Agronomy Field Handbook, Chapter 6. USDA, NRCS, Gainesville, FL.

Florida Phosphorus Index Work Group. 2000. The Florida phosphorus index. <http://efotg.nrcs.usda.gov/treemenuFS.aspx?Fips=12001&MenuName=menuFL.zip> (The Florida Phosphorus Index sheets are located in Section IV of the Table of Contents under C.Tools.)

Thomas, B.P., E. Cummins, and W.H. Wittstruck. 1985. Soil Survey of Alachua County, Florida. USDA/SCS in cooperation with the University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, Agricultural Experimental Stations and Soil Science Department; Alachua County Board of County Commissioners; and Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.