Print Close

Ranking Tool Summary

for FY2013 - Area 2-Middle Sevier - Fremont River BFR Pasture

(Released 01/18/2013)

Description:

Pasture

Land Uses:

Pasture

Efficiency Score:

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 100 - 67	Medium: 66 - 34	Low: 33 - 0
High	Medium	Low

Optional Notes:

National Priorities:

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 250 - 167	Medium: 166 - 83	Low: 82 - 0
High	Medium	Low

Questions:

Number	Question	Points
1	a. Is the program application to support the development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP)? If answer is “Yes”, do not answer any other national level questions. If answer is “No”, proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section.	250
2	a. Meet regulatory requirements relating to animal feeding operations, or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures?	15
2	b. Reduce sediment, nutrients or pesticides from agricultural operations located within a field that adjoins a designated "impaired water body" (TMDL, 303d, etc.)?	15
2	c. Reduce sediment, nutrients or pesticides from agricultural operations located within a field that adjoins a "non-impaired water body"?	5
3	a. Decrease aquifer overdraft?	15
3	b. Conserve water from irrigation system improvements and saved water will be available for other beneficial uses?	10
3	c. Conserve water in an area where the applicant participates in a geographically established or watershed-wide project?	5
4	a. Meet on-farm regulatory requirements relating to air quality or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures?	15
4	b. Reduce on-farm generated green house gases such as CO2 (Carbon Dioxide), CH4 (Methane), and N2O (Nitrous Oxide)?	15
4	c. Increase on-farm carbon sequestration?	5
5	a. Reduce erosion to tolerable limits (Soil "T")?	15
5	b. Improve soil tilth, organic matter, structure, health, etc.?	5
6	a. Benefit on-farm habitat associated with threatened and endangered, at-risk,	15

	candidate, or species of concern as identified in a State wildlife plan?	
6	b. Help retain wildlife and plant habitat on land exiting the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)?	10
7	a. Help manage or control noxious or invasive plant species on non-cropland?	10
7	b. Increase, or improve habitat to benefit pollinator or other targeted wildlife species?	10
7	c. Properly dispose of livestock carcasses?	5
7	d. Are identified in an Integrated Pest Management plan?	10
7	e. Are identified in a Nutrient Management plan?	10
7	f. Apply principles of adaptive nutrient management?	5
8	a. Reduce energy consumption on the agricultural operation?	15
8	b. Increase on-farm energy efficiency with practices and improvements identified in an approved energy audit equivalent to criteria required in Ag EMP (122,124)?	10
8	c. Assist in implementing energy conservation measures that also reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants?	10
9	a. Implementation of all conservation practices scheduled in the contract on the CPA-1155 within three years of date of obligation?	10
9	b. Improvement of existing conservation practices or conservation systems already in place at the time the application is accepted?	5
9	c. Implementation of practice(s) which will complete an existing conservation system or suite of practices?	5
	Total Points	500

State Issues:

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 250 - 167	Medium: 133 - 84	Low: 83 - 0
High	Medium	Low

Questions:

Sub-heading Number	Question Number	Question	Points
1		If the application is for development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP), the agency will assign significant ranking priority and conservation benefit by answering “Yes” to the following question. Answering “Yes” to question 1a will result in the application being awarded the maximum amount of points that can be earned for the national priority category.	
	1	Is the program application to support the development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP)? If answer is “Yes”, do not answer any other national level questions. If answer is “No”, proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section.	250
2		Wildlife	
	2	Will the practices installed facilitate improvement in the habitat for sensitive, threatened, or endangered species?	50
3		Weeds	
	3	Will the practices installed control all invasive species present on the offered acres?	50
4		Water Quality	
	4	Will practices be installed to improve the identified TMDL impairment adjacent to and/or located less than 1320 feet from a TMDL identified water body?	50
5		Grazing Lands	
	5	Will the practices installed result in the implementation of a planned grazing	50

		system?	
6		Pollinator Habitat	
	6	Will this application include development of food, cover, and/or nest sites for native pollinators in accordance with Utah Technical Guide Notice UT238?	50
		Maximum Points: Total Points	500

Local Issues:

Scoring Multiplier: 3.910

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 115 - 77	Medium: 76 - 39	Low: 38 - 0
High	Medium	Low

Questions:

Sub-heading Number	Question Number	Question	Points
1		If the application is for development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP), the agency will assign significant ranking priority and conservation benefit by answering “Yes” to the following question. Answering “Yes” to question 1a will result in the application being awarded the maximum amount of points that can be earned for the national priority category.	
	1	Is the program application to support the development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP)? If answer is “Yes”, do not answer any other national level questions. If answer is “No”, proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section.	115
2		Priority Area	
	2	Is the proposed project located in a LWG priority area and addresses the resource issues for that area?	5
3		Priority Resource Concerns	
	3	Does the proposed project address 4 or more LWG priority resource concerns?	9
	4	Does the proposed project address 2 or 3 resource concerns that are not LWG priority resource concerns?	6
	5	Does the proposed project address 1 resource concern that is not a LWG priority resource concerns?	3
4		Non-Priority Resource Concerns	
	6	Does the proposed project address 4 or more resource concerns that are not LWG priority resource concerns?	6
	7	Does the proposed project address 2 or 3 resource concerns that are not LWG priority resource concerns?	4
	8	Does the proposed project address 1 resource concern that is not a LWG priority resource concerns?	2
5		Economics	
	9	Will the total project cost be <$200 per acre?	45
	10	Will the total project cost be between $201 and $400 per acre?	40
	11	Will the total project cost be between $401 and $600 per acre?	35
	12	Will the total project cost be between $601 and $800 per acre?	30
	13	Will the total project cost be between $801 and $1000 per acre?	25
	14	Will the total project cost be between $1001 and $1200 per acre?	20
	15	Will the total project cost be between $1201 and $1,400 per acre?	15
	16	Will the total project cost be between $1401 and $1600 per acre?	10
	17	Will the total project cost be between $1601 and $1800 per acre?	5

6		Pasture Condition Score	
	18	Is the change in PCS , as calculated using the designated PCS score sheet for EQIP, greater than 13?	50
	19	Is the change in PCS , as calculated using the designated PCS score sheet for EQIP, between 9 and 12.9?	40
	20	Is the change in PCS , as calculated using the designated PCS score sheet for EQIP, between 6 and 8.9?	30
	21	Is the change in PCS , as calculated using the designated PCS score sheet for EQIP, between 3 and 5.9?	20
	22	Is the change in PCS , as calculated using the designated PCS score sheet for EQIP, between 1 and 2.9?	10
		Maximum Points: Total Points	525

Selected Resource Concerns and Practices:

Plant Condition: Productivity, Health and Vigor
- Animal Trails and Walkways (575)
- Brush Management (314)
- Critical Area Planting (342)
- Dike (356)
- Diversion (362)
- Fence (382)
- Filter Strip (393)
- Forage and Biomass Planting (512)
- Grade Stabilization Structure (410)
- Grazing Management Plan - Written (110)
- Heavy Use Area Protection (561)
- Herbaceous Weed Control (315)
- Irrigation Ditch Lining (428)
- Irrigation Field Ditch (388)
- Irrigation Land Leveling (464)
- Irrigation Pipeline (430)
- Irrigation Reservoir (436)
- Irrigation System, Microirrigation (441)
- Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442)
- Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurfac (443)
- Irrigation Water Management (449)
- Irrigation Water Management Plan - Writt (118)
- Land Smoothing (466)
- Livestock Pipeline (516)
- Nutrient Management Plan - Written (104)
- Pollinator Habitat Plan - Written (146)
- Pond (378)
- Pond Sealing - Clay Treatment (521D)
- Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealan (521C)
- Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membran (521A)
- Prescribed Grazing (528)
- Pumping Plant (533)
- Stream Crossing (578)
- Structure for Water Control (587)
- Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)
- Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)
- Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)
- Water Well (642)
- Watering Facility (614)
- Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380)

Water Quantity: Inefficient Water Use on Irrigated Land
- Forage and Biomass Planting (512)
- Herbaceous Weed Control (315)

Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320)
Irrigation Ditch Lining (428)
Irrigation Field Ditch (388)
Irrigation Land Leveling (464)
Irrigation Pipeline (430)
Irrigation Reservoir (436)
Irrigation System, Microirrigation (441)
Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442)
Irrigation Water Management (449)
Irrigation Water Management Plan - Writt (118)
Livestock Pipeline (516)
Pollinator Habitat Plan - Written (146)
Pond (378)
Pond Sealing - Clay Treatment (521D)
Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealan (521C)
Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membran (521A)
Prescribed Grazing (528)
Pumping Plant (533)
Structure for Water Control (587)
Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)
Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)
Windbreak/Shelterbelt Renovation (650)

2.39.1.17656_P