



USDA-NRCS—Salt Lake City, Utah

Colorado River Salinity Control Program

Screening Criteria, Ranking Tool Questions and Instructions

Note to all users: The official Ranking Tools are located in Protracts.

2007-Environmental Quality Incentives

Screening Criteria

(See definitions on Page 5)

Participant Name: _____ Protracts ID # _____

NRCS Employee Screening Application: _____ Date: _____

General Requirements

The project must reside within a designated USDA-Salinity Control Program Project Area at the time of ranking:

1. **Uintah Basin** – Designated Parts of Duchesne and Uintah Counties, Utah
2. **Price – San Rafael** – Designated Parts of Carbon and Emery Counties, Utah
3. **Muddy Creek** – Designated Part of Emery County, Utah
4. **Manila-Washam** – Designated Part of Daggett County, Utah and Part of Sweetwater County, Wyoming

Basis of ranking in large part determined by the **projects potential to reduce salt loading** to tributaries of the Colorado River.

Questions on the use of the ranking tool should be directed through Gary Roeder, Area Programs Specialist to Julie Nelson, State Economist.



A. Has applicant / participant provided adequate evidence of control of the operating unit for the required contract period.

Yes _____ No _____

B. Has applicant / participant agreed to obtain permission from Canal Company for any modifications to their delivery system.

Yes _____ No _____ N/A _____

C. Has applicant / participant provided adequate information for NRCS to determine benchmark resource conditions to determine project ranking?

Yes _____ No _____

D. Has applicant / participant made resource decisions necessary for NRCS to adequately determine resource benefits of their proposed project and to start construction within one year of contract approval?

Yes _____ No _____

E. If applicant is part of a group project, is there an agreement in place for the Operation and Maintenance of that part of the project?

Yes _____ No _____ N/A _____

F. Have all existing and previous EQIP/Basin States Parallel Program contracts been kept on schedule with all contract items being satisfactorily completed?

Yes _____ No _____ N/A _____

G. The individual priority for this application is: (see business rule #1 for determining local workgroup priority.)

_____ High _____ Medium _____ Low

Applicant Signature: _____

QR Date: _____ Initials: _____

Notes: See Definitions, page 5 of these instructions.

Completing Item G, Screening Tool

The priorities set by local workgroups separate projects that have organized into groups, with additional consideration given for those with non-USDA financial assistance from salinity control partners. Group planning and implementation activities usually achieve the following:

1. The total cost of the project is reduced by elimination of duplicate practices and sharing the cost and installation of practices between landowners.
2. It provides more efficient use of NRCS conservation planning time which subsequently reduces technical assistance cost to NRCS.
3. Group projects allow the use of a watershed approach that is based on sound ecological principles which achieves more efficient, coordinated, and cost effective salt load reduction.

[See Appendix for definition and clarification of screening terminology](#)

Select HIGH PRIORITY if.....

- The applicant is part of an organized group project with delivery system in place, *Or*.....
- The applicant is completing a system with previously installed infrastructure.

Note: The applicant must agree to three years of contracted irrigation water management to receive High Priority.

Select MEDIUM PRIORITY if.....

- This is an individual application, **AND**
- The applicant meets delivery system requirements, **AND**
- The applicant agrees to at least two years of contracted irrigation water management.

Select LOW PRIORITY if.....

- The applicant is an individual project with no delivery system in place.
- The applicant agrees to one year of contracted irrigation water management.
- The applicant is rehabilitating a previously cost shared irrigation system.
- Any situation that does not result in high or medium priority designation.

Proceed to page three.....

EQIP National Priorities

1. *Reductions of nonpoint source pollution, such as nutrients, sediment, pesticides, or excess salinity in impaired watersheds consistent with TMDLs where available as well as the reduction of groundwater contamination and reduction of point sources such as contamination from confined animal feeding operations;*
2. *Conservation of ground and surface water resources;*
3. *Reduction of emissions, such as particulate matter, nitrogen oxides (NOx), volatile organic compounds, and ozone precursors and depleters that contribute to air quality impairment violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards;*
4. *Reduction in soil erosion and sedimentation from unacceptable levels on agricultural land; and*
5. *Promotion of at-risk species habitat conservation.*

Access Road (560)
 Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface (443)
 Alley Cropping (311)
 Irrigation Water Management (449)
 Amendments for the Treatment of Agricultural Waste (591)
 Mulching (484)
 Anaerobic Digester, Controlled Temperature (366)
 Nutrient Management (590)
 Animal Mortality Facility (316)
 Pasture and Hay Planting (512)
 Anionic Polyacrylamide (PAM) Erosion Control (450)
 Pest Management (595)
 Atmospheric Resource Quality Management (370)
 Prescribed Burning (338)
 Closure of Waste Impoundment (360)
 Prescribed Grazing (528)
 Composting Facility (317)
 Pumping Plant (533)
 Conservation Cover (327)
 Range Planting (550)
 Conservation Crop Rotation (328)
 Recreation Area Improvement (562)
 Constructed Wetland (656)
 Recreation Land Grading and Shaping (566)
 Contour Buffer Strips (332)
 Recreation Trail and Walkway (568)
 Contour Farming (330)
 Residue Management, Seasonal (344)
 Contour Orchard and Other Fruit Area (331)
 Restoration and Management of Declining Habitats (643)
 Cover Crop (340)
 Riparian Forest Buffer (391)
 Critical Area Planting (342)
 Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390)
 Cross Wind Ridges (589A)
 Rock Barrier (555)
 Cross Wind Trap Strips (589C)

Screening, Ranking Protocol

- If **no** is answered to any question A-F of the screening tool, AND if priority designation in question G **does not result in high or medium priority**, [NRCS will not complete ranking of this application at this time.](#)
- Applications that result in a **yes or NA** (Not Applicable) answer for questions A-F of the screening tool AND meet at a minimum **high or medium priority** [will be ranked during the appropriate batching period](#) based upon the date of the application.

NATIONAL Priority Issues

Question 1: Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in considerable reductions of non-point source pollution, such as nutrients, sediment, pesticides, excess salinity in impaired watersheds consistent with TMDL's where available as well as the reduction of groundwater contamination or point source such as contamination from confined animal feeding operations?

- **To claim these points, the proposed project must be expected to meet quality criteria for all applicable NRCS Water Quality criteria.**

Question 2: Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in the conservation of a considerable amount of ground or surface water resources?

- **To claim these points, the proposed project must be expected to meet quality criteria for all applicable NRCS Water Quantity criteria.**

Question 3: Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in a considerable reduction of emissions, such as particulate matter, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), volatile organic compounds, and ozone precursors and depleters that contribute to air quality impairment violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards?

- **To claim these points, the proposed project must include one or more of the conservation practices on pages 3 and 4.**

Question 4: Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in a considerable reduction in soil erosion and sedimentation from unacceptable levels on agricultural land?

- **To claim these points, soil erosion must go from above T to below T as a result of the proposed project OR Quality Criteria for Soil Condition; Rangeland Site Stability must be met as a result of implementing the proposed project**

Question 5: Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in a considerable increase in the promotion of at-risk species habitat conservation?

- **To claim these points, the project must be expected to meet quality criteria for one or more of the four national at-risk species resource concerns, which are:**
 - **Plant Condition; Threatened and Endangered Plant Species**
 - **Plant Condition; T&E Plant Species: Declining Species, Species of Concern**
 - **Fish and Wildlife; Threatened and Endangered Fish and Wildlife Species**
 - **Fish and Wildlife; T&E Species: Declining Species, Species of Concern**

At-risk **plant** species are in Appendix C. - Rare Plant Species by Habitat Type

At-risk **animal** species are in Appendix A. - Utah CWCS Tier I, II, and III Species List.

See Utah-NRCS Website—Programs-EQIP tab.

Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395)
 Deep Tillage (324)
 Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580)
 Drainage Water Management (554)
 Stripcropping (585)
 Feed Management (592)
 Surface Roughening (609)
 Field Border (386)
 Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)
 Filter Strip (393)
 Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)
 Firebreak (394)
 Use Exclusion (472)
 Forest Site Preparation (490)
 Vegetative Barrier (601)
 Forest Stand Improvement (666)
 Waste Facility Cover (367)
 Fuel Break (383)
 Waste Storage Facility (313)
 Grassed Waterway (412)
 Waste Treatment Lagoon (359)
 Grazing Land Mechanical Treatment (548)
 Waste Utilization (633)
 Heavy Use Area Protection (561)
 Wastewater Treatment Strip (635)
 Hedgerow Planting (422)
 Wetland Creation (658)
 Herbaceous Wind Barriers (603)
 Wetland Enhancement (659)
 Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320)
 Wetland Restoration (657)
 Irrigation Field Ditch (388)
 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)
 Irrigation System, Microirrigation (441)
 Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380)
 Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442)
 Windbreak/Shelterbelt Renovation (650)

STATE Priority Issues

Question 1: Is the applicant addressing noxious Species as identified by the State or County or Cooperative Weed Management Area. Contact your local weed supervisor or county agent to identify if the target species is of concern. If answered yes, these species must be addressed through the appropriate practices in the contract.

1. Does the plan address control of an invasive species identified by a state, county, or local government or by a local Cooperative Weed Management Area as being a noxious species?

Question 2: Is the planned project in an approved area wide plan as defined by the National Planning Procedures Handbook, UT Bulletin 300-7-04 and been designated as such by the Assistant for Field Operations? In order to answer yes to this question all of these REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET.

2. Is this project in an area that is covered by an approved areawide plan as defined by the National Planning Procedures Handbook ?

LOCAL Priority Issues

Allowable points for local issues are based on a sliding scale with lower cost per ton receiving higher points. The scale is broken down into twenty five questions on the local issues. Choose the one best answer that corresponds to the resultant cost per ton calculated from the salinity cost effectiveness spreadsheet. The use of the salinity spreadsheet is required to document the calculated cost per ton for each project. **Points are only allowed for one answer in this section.**

Questions 1-25: Is the cost share per ton of salt reduced as follows (see AERT)?

Utilize Salinity Spreadsheet, January 2006. Available for download from EFOTG, Section 1. (NOTE: Utilize most current version)

Allowable points for local issues address the cost share per ton of salt reduced for the applicant. Cost per ton of salt is based on a number of factors which includes;

- where the applicant is located (loading factor for the watershed),
- crops grown,
- water availability,
- consumptive use of the crop,
- baseline irrigation efficiency,
- planned irrigation efficiency,
- federal cost of improvements, based on 75% of total cost
- federal Technical Assistance
- amortization rate over 25 years

Appendix to Application Screening Tool Colorado River Salinity Control Fund Pool

Definition of Terms:

Delivery System – The method of water delivery which is compatible with the planned contract improvements.

- For a gravity pressure system, the delivery system must be conveyed in a method that supplies the pressure necessary for efficient and effective operation of the planned (contracted) irrigation method.
- For a pumped pressure system, the delivery system may be any conveyance that supplies the water necessary (volume, duration and frequency of delivery) for efficient and effective operation of the planned (contracted) irrigation method.

Organized Group – Two or more individuals that share in the installation, cost, operation and or maintenance of the installed structural practices. This would include practices such as irrigation conveyance pipelines, structures for water control, pumps, valves, pressure reducing stations, etc.

Individual - A program applicant that does not rely on a group for shared installation, cost, and is totally responsible for the operation, and maintenance of installed structural and management practices of the system.

Rehabilitating a previously cost shared irrigation system - An irrigation system that has received funding from various historical salinity program funding sources such as ACP-Salinity, Colorado River Salinity Control Program (CRSCP) where salt reduction has already been reported by USDA. Rehabilitation includes replacement of worn infrastructure such as sprinklers, valves, nozzles, gaskets, conversion from improved flood to wheeline or pivot, or conversion from wheeline to pivot.