

Ranking Pool: WA FY22 Puyallup 1633 RCPP-ALE

Program: RCPP-ALE States: WA (Admin) Pool Status: Active

Template: FY2021 RCPP-ALE

Template Active

**Last Modified By:** Carlee Elliott

**Last Modified:** 01-28-2022

#### **Land Uses**

| Land Use           | Modifier 1 | Modifier 2 | Modifier 3 | Modifier 4 | Modifier 5 | Modifier 6 |
|--------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Crop               |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Forest             |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Range              |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Pasture            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Farmstead          |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Developed Land     |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Water              |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Other Rural Land   |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Associated Ag Land |            |            |            |            |            |            |

#### **Resource Concern Categories**

| Categories                   |       |           |       |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Category                     | Min % | Default % | Max % |
| Long term protection of land | 40    | 75        | 75    |
| Soil quality limitations     | 0     | 5         | 50    |
| Source water depletion       | 0     | 20        | 40    |

| Long term protection of land |       |           |       |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Resource Concern             | Min % | Default % | Max % |
| Threat of conversion         | 100   | 100       | 100   |

| Soil quality limitations |       |           |       |
|--------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Resource Concern         | Min % | Default % | Max % |
| Aggregate instability    | 0     | 50        | 100   |

01-28-2022 Page 1 of 6

| Soil quality limitations |       |           |       |
|--------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Resource Concern         | Min % | Default % | Max % |
| Organic matter depletion | 0     | 50        | 100   |

| Source water depletion           |       |           |       |  |
|----------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|--|
| Resource Concern                 | Min % | Default % | Max % |  |
| Groundwater depletion            | 0     | 20        | 100   |  |
| Inefficient irrigation water use | 0     | 40        | 100   |  |
| Surface water depletion          | 0     | 40        | 100   |  |

#### **Practices**

| Practice Name  | Practice Code | Practice Type |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search          | LTAPERS       | Easements     |
| Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review        | LTAPTR1       | Easements     |
| Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review       | LTAPTR2       | Easements     |
| Long-Term Protection of Land - Maximum Duration Allowed by State Law | LTPMAS        | Easements     |
| Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement                    | LTPPE         | Easements     |

#### **Ranking Weights**

| Factors                  | Algorithm | Allowable Min | Default | Allowable Max |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| Vulnerabilities          | Default   | 5             | 5       | 20            |
| Planned Practice Effects | Default   | 5             | 5       | 10            |
| Resource Priorities      | Default   | 35            | 40      | 50            |
| Program Priorities       | Default   | 40            | 50      | 50            |
| Efficiencies             | Default   | 0             | 0       | 0             |

## **Display Group: WA FY22 Puyallup 1633 RCPP-ALE (Active)**

An asterisk will be displayed to show that it is a conditional section or conditional question.

### **Survey: Applicability Question**

| Section: Is this application located in Puyallup 1633? |                       |  |  |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| Question   | Answer Choices Points |  |  |
| Is this application located in Puyallup 1633?          | Yes                   |  |  |
| is this application located in Fuyanup 1055?           | No                    |  |  |

01-28-2022 Page 2 of 6

## **Survey: Category Questions**

| Section: Does the land offered for enrollment qualify for at least one land eligibility category? |                |        |  |  |
|---|----------------|--------|--|--|
| Question  | Answer Choices | Points |  |  |
| Does the land offered for enrollment qualify for at least one land                                | YES            |        |  |  |
| eligibility category?   | NO             |        |  |  |

# **Survey: Program Questions**

| Section: National ranking criteria  |  |        |  |
|---|--|--------|--|
| Question  | Answer Choices   | Points |  |
|   | Property has 50% or less                               | 0      |  |
|   | Property has >50 to 60%                                | 20     |  |
| Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland soils in the parcel to be protected.   | Property has >60 to 70%                                | 25     |  |
|   | Property has >70 to 80%                                | 30     |  |
|   | Property has >80%                                      | 35     |  |
|   | Property has 33% or less                               | 0      |  |
| Percent of cropland, rangeland, grassland, historic grassland,  | Property has >33 to < 40%                              | 4      |  |
| pastureland, or nonindustrial private forest land in parcel to be protected.  | Property has >40 to < 50%                              | 8      |  |
|   | Property has >50%                                      | 15     |  |
| Patio of the total acros of land in the parcel to be protected to average   | Ratio of 1.0 or less                                   | 0      |  |
| Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average<br>arm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of<br>Agriculture. | Ratio > 1.0 to <2.0                                    | 7      |  |
| Agriculture.  | Ratio > 2.0  | 15     |  |
|   | Decrease of 0% or less.                                | 0      |  |
| Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland,   | Decrease of >0 and <5%.                                | 3      |  |
| pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in<br>the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA                     | Decrease of >5 and <10%.                               | 5      |  |
| Censuses of Agriculture.(USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)   | Decrease of >10 and <15%.                              | 8      |  |
|   | Decreases >15%.  | 15     |  |
|   | No Plan  | 0      |  |
| Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address farm viability for future generations.                                      | Plan   | 2      |  |
| established to address farm viability for future generations.   | Plan documented and prepared by industry professional. | 5      |  |
|   | Decrease of 0% or less                                 | 0      |  |
| Decrease in the percentage of acreage of farm and ranch land in the   | Decrease of >0 and <5%.                                | 1      |  |
| county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA   | Decrease of >5 and <10%.                               | 5      |  |
| Censuses of Agriculture. (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)  | Decease of >10 and <15%.                               | 9      |  |
|   | Decreases >15%.  | 15     |  |

01-28-2022 Page 3 of 6

| Section: National ranking criteria  |  |        |  |
|---|--|--------|--|
| Question  | Answer Choices   | Points |  |
|   | Growth rate of less than one times the State growth rate.  | 0      |  |
| Percent population growth in the county as documented by the U.S. Census. (Census Bureau Home Page)   | Growth rate of greater than one and less than or equal to two times the State growth rate.                 | 4      |  |
| Cerisus. (Cerisus Bureau Florrie Fage)  | Growth rate of two and less than or equal to three times the State growth rate.                            | 7      |  |
|   | Growth rate of more than three times the State growth rate.  | 15     |  |
|   | Population density less than one times the State population density.                                       | 0      |  |
|   | Population density of greater than one and less than or equal to two times the State population density.   | 4      |  |
| most recent U.S. Census. (Census Bureau Home Page)  | Population density of greater than two and less than or equal to three times the State population density. | 7      |  |
|   | Population density of greater than three times the State population density.                               | 15     |  |
| Proximity of the parcel to other protected land, such as compatible   | Easement Offer Area (EAO) boundary greater than 3 miles from the protected land boundary.                  | 0      |  |
| nilitary installations; land owned in fee title by the United States or an Indian Tribe, State or local government, or by a nongovernmental organization whose purpose is to protect agricultural use and related conservation values; or land that is already subject to an easement or leed restriction that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural | EOA is greater than 1 mile but less than 3 miles from protected land.                                      | 4      |  |
|   | EOA is within 1 mile of protected land boundary.   | 7      |  |
| use or protects grazing uses and related conservation values.   | EOA boundary adjoins protected land boundary.  | 15     |  |
|   | Easement Offer Area (EOA) boundary greater than 3 miles in proximity.                                      | 0      |  |
| Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure.   | EOA is greater than or equal to 1 mile but less than 3 miles in proximity.                                 | 3      |  |
| illiasii uoture.  | EOA is within 1 mile in proximity.   | 5      |  |
|   | EOA boundary adjoins.  | 10     |  |
|   | Parcel increases a protected agricultural use area.  | U      |  |
| Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use.  | Parcel is a contiguous or proximal expansion of agricultural use protected area.                           | 6      |  |
|   | Parcel links two non-continuous corridors of protected agricultural use.                                   | 15     |  |
| Land is currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within 1 year and is grassland that would benefit from protection under   | Yes  | 5      |  |
| a long-term easement or is land under a CRP contract that is in transition to a covered farmer or rancher pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 3835(f)   | No   | 0      |  |
| Land is grassland of special environmental significance that would  | Yes  | 10     |  |
| benefit from protection under a long-term easement.   | No   | 0      |  |
| Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that   | 25%  | 15     |  |
| is the eligible entitys own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than  | 12.5 to less than 25%.   | 5      |  |
| the landowner.  | Less than 12.5%.   | 0      |  |

01-28-2022 Page 4 of 6

# **Survey: Resource Questions**

| Section: State Developed questions  Question  Answer Choices  Points  |  |    |  |
|---|--|----|--|
| auestion  | N/A  | 0  |  |
| Protecting the parcel provides multifunctional benefits of farm or ranch land protection or improvement, such as: Percent of Prime or unique soils in the parcel to be protected is greater than 25 percent of the total parcel acreage. Note: Documentation must be provided to receive points under this category   |  | 15 |  |
|   | 25-50%   |    |  |
|   | 51-74%   | 25 |  |
|   | 75% or greater   | 35 |  |
| Eligible entity has demonstrated performance in managing and enforcing easements by monitoring 80 percent or more of its easements each year.   | Yes  | 15 |  |
|   | No   | 0  |  |
| Protecting the parcel provides multifunctional benefits of farm or ranch land protection or improvement, such as: Parcel contains historical or archaeological resources that will be protected by easement area as described in 528.33.B (2). Note: Documentation must be provided to receive points under this category   | Yes  | 5  |  |
|   | No   | 0  |  |
| 3. Protecting the parcel provides multifunctional benefits of farm or ranch land protection or improvement, such as: Will social and economic benefits be derived by enrolling lands from historically underserved groups (528.190.DDD, small scale farmers (USDA definition: <\$250,000 gross annual sales USDA Small Farm Definitions - eXtension), limited resource landowners (528.190.NNN), beginning farmer or ranchers (528.190.M) or veteran landowners (528.190.PPPP)? Note: Documentation must be provided to receive points under this category  | Yes  | 15 |  |
|   | No   | 0  |  |
| Enrollment of parcel will provide diversity of natural resource protections or improvements Project is wholly or partially within the boundaries of the Western Washington Prairie Oak Woodland or old growth mature forest areas as referenced in Pierce County Code Title 18E.40 Critical Areas or shown on maps of WDFW Priority Habitats.   | Yes  | 5  |  |
|   | No   | 0  |  |
| Parcel contains habitat for at-risk species: Federal or State listed or candidate Threatened or Endangered species located on, or within quarter mile, of parcel to be protected. This includes USFWS & NMFS Designated Critical Habitat polygons for listed species. Reference Pierce County Code Title 18E.40 Critical Areas and WDFW Priority Habitats and Species.  | Yes  | 30 |  |
|   | No   | 0  |  |
| Protecting the parcel provides multifunctional benefits of farm or ranch land protection or improvement, such as: Is parcel to be protected in an area zoned as agricultural use or open space? The property/ies have a land use designation of Agriculture Resource Land (ARL), Rural Farm (RF) or Forest Land (FL) OR The property/ies are located in a rural area and zoned Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR), Rural Separator (RSP), Rural 10 (R10), Rural 20 (R20), Rural 40 (R40), AND defined as Open Space Land pursuant to RCW 84.34.020 and used for agricultural operations. Note: Documentation must be provided to receive points under this category | Yes  | 10 |  |
|   | No   | 0  |  |
| Has there been, or is there in process at the time of application, recent significant capital investment(s) that enhance the long term agricultural viability of the parcel being offered for protection and the investment will be further protected by the conservation easement? Note:  Documentation must be provided to receive points under this category   | Yes, investment within past 2 calendar years.            | 20 |  |
|   | Yes, application for RCPP EQIP investment is in process. | 20 |  |
|   | Yes, investment within past 3-5 calendar years.          | 8  |  |
|   | Yes, investment within past 6-10 calendar years.         | 4  |  |
|   | No, or greater than 10 years.                            | 0  |  |

01-28-2022 Page 5 of 6

| Section: State Developed questions  |   |        |  |
|---|---|--------|--|
| Question  | Answer Choices                          | Points |  |
| Proximity to the Urban Growth Boundary. How threatened is the proposed parcel for protection? (Pierce County designated Urban Growth Urban Service Areas as defined in the 2015 Update to the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan)   | Adjacent to a UGA.                      | 25     |  |
|   | Within 1000 feet of a UGA.              | 15     |  |
|   | Within 1 mile of a UGA.                 | 10     |  |
|   | N/A                                     | 0      |  |
| Presence and proximity to open space or biodiversity corridors. (Pierce County designated Open Space Corridors as defined in the 2015 Update to the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan)   | Within 200 feet.                        | 10     |  |
|   | Within half mile.                       | 5      |  |
|   | N/A                                     | 0      |  |
| Adjacency and proximity to hydrological features as defined by Pierce County (streams) Hydro-Centerlines and (waterbodies) Hydro-Surface-Boundaries:  | Within 200 feet of a stream.            | 20     |  |
|   | Within 200 feet of a waterbody.         | 20     |  |
|   | Within 200 feet of a 100-yr floodplain. | 20     |  |
|   | N/A                                     | 0      |  |
| Will the conservation easement deed prohibit the legal or de facto subdivision of the property and contain language that requires all existing parcels encumbered by the easement to be conveyed together as a single parcel? (To be awarded these points the cooperating entity must submit draft deed language they will be using that satisfies the intent of this ranking criteria question. Final acceptance of this language will be done during the NRCS deed review period prior to closing.) | Yes                                     | 10     |  |
|   | No                                      | 0      |  |

01-28-2022 Page 6 of 6