**Total acres**

The total acres of digitized map features associated with the selected scenarios.  
  
The number in the parentheses (if applicable) represents the total acres of digitized map features and their respective upland contributing areas.  
  
For example, a *baseline change* scenario may have two map features, both five acres in size. These 10 acres of digitized features may affect 25 acres of upland area. Therefore the reported *total acres* for this scenario would be listed as: 10 (35); 10 for the digitized acres, 35 for the digitized acres plus the upland area.  
  
Note that if a report includes a mixture of different scenario types, the total acres could be larger than the number in the parentheses. This would result from *baseline NPS* scenarios that do not include an estimate of upland area having their digitized acres counting towards the *total acres* value, but not towards the value that considers upland area (i.e. the value in the parentheses).

**Acres by HIT LC/BMP**

The number of acres of each of the land cover change or best management practice options associated with the selected HIT-modeled scenarios.

**Acres by L-THIA LC/BMP**

The number of acres of each of the land cover change or best management practice options associated with the selected L-THIA-modeled scenarios.

**HIT sediment loading**

Total sediment loading as modeled by HIT across the selected scenarios.  
  
The total is calculated by each of the three scenarios types as follows:  
  
*Baseline NPS* - total reported sediment loading  
  
*Baseline change* - total sediment loading calculated for the change scenario (e.g. the total sediment loading under a change to *no-till*, not the change in loading from a baseline condition attributable to a change to *no-till*). This corresponds to the “*Calculated sediment loading (tons/yr)”* line within the Field-scale Analysis - Results window.  
  
*Dual scenario change* - total sediment loading calculated for the second scenario (e.g. the total sediment loading under the *change to* scenario, not the *change from* scenario. This corresponds to the “*Sed. load in affected areas, Scenario 2 (tons/yr)”* line within the Field-scale Analysis - Results window.

**HIT soil erosion**

Total soil erosion as modeled by HIT across the selected scenarios.  
  
The total is calculated by each of the three scenarios types as follows:  
  
*Baseline NPS* - total reported soil erosion  
  
*Baseline change* - total soil erosion calculated for the change scenario (e.g. the total sediment loading under a change to *no-till*, not the change in loading from a baseline condition attributable to a change to *no-till*). This corresponds to the “*Calculated erosion (tons/yr)”* line within the Field-scale Analysis - Results window.  
  
*Dual scenario change* - total soil erosion calculated for the second scenario (e.g. the total soil erosion under the *change to* scenario, not the *change from* scenario. This corresponds to the “*Erosion in affected areas, Scenario 2 (tons/yr)”* line within the Field-scale Analysis - Results window.

**HIT sediment loading saved by LCBMP**

The total amount of sediment loading saved by HIT-modeled land cover changes or best management practices (LCBMP) across selected scenarios, and the savings associated with each particular LCBMP.  
  
These totals are only calculated for *baseline change* or *dual scenario change* analyses, not for *baseline NPS* analyses.  
  
Note that the estimates listed with each selected LCBMP do not necessarily represent the total amount saved by a particular LCBMP. This is due to the fact that a single scenario run produces a single savings value, even though the scenario may have included several different LCBMPs.  
  
For example, one *baseline change* scenario may have had three map features digitized (a conversion to alfalfa, a no-till BMP, and a filter strip BMP). That output of that scenario would be a single reduction value in soil erosion and sediment loading.  
  
In the report produced here, each of the respective totals for three LCBMPs would include that single savings value. If that scenario was the only one included in a report, all three LCBMPs would list the same savings. This also explains why the sum of individual LCBMP savings does not equal the total savings listed above. Therefore, the values listed here are described as the savings 'associated' with a particular LCBMP, not the total amount saved by an LCBMP. If a scenario or group of scenarios only contained one LCBMP, or if each individual scenario was limited to a single LCBMP, then the savings would represent the total amount saved by each LCBMP.

This corresponds to the “*Sediment load* ***INCREASE/DECREASE*** *(tons/yr)”* line within the Field-scale Analysis - Results window.

Note that if sediment loading across all of the included scenarios was estimated to increase according to the HIT model, the value reported would be negative (i.e., no sediment loading was saved).

**HIT soil erosion saved by LCBMP**

The total amount of soil erosion saved by HIT-modeled land cover changes or best management practices (LCBMP) across selected scenarios, and the savings associated with each particular LCBMP.  
  
These savings are only calculated for *baseline change* or *dual scenario change* analyses, not for *baseline NPS* analyses.  
  
Note that the estimates listed with each selected LCBMP do not necessarily represent the total amount saved by a particular LCBMP. This is due to the fact that a single scenario run produces a single savings value, even though the scenario may have included several different LCBMPs.  
  
For example, one *baseline change* scenario may have had three map features digitized (a conversion to alfalfa, a no-till BMP, and a filter strip BMP). That output of that scenario would be a single reduction value in soil erosion and sediment loading.  
  
In the report produced here, each of the respective totals for three LCBMPs would include that single savings value. If that scenario was the only one included in a report, all three LCBMPs would list the same savings. This also explains why the sum of individual LCBMP savings does not equal the total savings listed above. Therefore, the values listed here are described as the savings 'associated' with a particular LCBMP, not the total amount saved by an LCBMP. If a scenario or group of scenarios only contained one LCBMP, or if each individual scenario was limited to a single LCBMP, then the savings would represent the total amount saved by each LCBMP.

This corresponds to the “*Erosion* ***INCREASE/DECREASE*** *(tons/yr)”* line within the Field-scale Analysis - Results window.

Note that if erosion across all of the included scenarios was estimated to increase according to the HIT model, the value reported would be negative (i.e., erosion was not reduced).

**L-THIA totals saved by LCBMP**

Total L-THIA-modeled savings by each LCBMP across the selected scenarios.

This corresponds to the “***INCREASE/DECREASE*** *(tons/yr)”* lines within the Field-scale Analysis - Results window.

These savings are only calculated for *baseline change* or *dual scenario change* analyses, not for *baseline NPS* analyses.