

Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool: NH FY23 ACEP-ALE General

Program: ACEP

Pool Status: Active

States: NH (Admin)

Template: ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

Template Status: Active

Last Modified By: Marques Munis

Last Modified: 01/12/2023

Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Crop	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Forest	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Range	--	--	N/A	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Pasture	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Farmstead	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Developed Land	N/A	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Water	N/A	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Other Rural Land	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Associated Ag Land	--	--	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Concentrated erosion	0	5	30
Degraded plant condition	0	5	50
Field pesticide loss	0	5	20
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	50
Livestock production limitation	0	5	50
Long term protection of land	40	45	75
Pest pressure	0	5	20
Salt losses to water	0	5	20
Soil quality limitations	0	5	50
Source water depletion	0	5	40
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	40

Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wind and water erosion	0	5	40

Concentrated erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels	0	20	100
Classic gully erosion	0	40	100
Ephemeral gully erosion	0	40	100

Degraded plant condition

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant productivity and health	0	50	100
Plant structure and composition	0	50	100

Field pesticide loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Pesticides transported to groundwater	0	50	100
Pesticides transported to surface water	0	50	100

Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	20	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	20	100
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to groundwater	0	20	100
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to surface water	0	20	100
Sediment transported to surface water	0	20	100

Livestock production limitation

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Feed and forage balance	0	40	100
Inadequate livestock shelter	0	15	100
Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution	0	45	100

Long term protection of land

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Threat of conversion	100	100	100

Pest pressure

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant pest pressure	0	100	100

Salt losses to water

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Salts transported to groundwater	0	50	100
Salts transported to surface water	0	50	100

Soil quality limitations

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aggregate instability	0	15	100
Compaction	0	15	100
Concentration of salts or other chemicals	0	15	100
Organic matter depletion	0	20	100
Soil organism habitat loss or degradation	0	20	100
Subsidence	0	15	100

Source water depletion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Groundwater depletion	0	35	100
Inefficient irrigation water use	0	35	100
Surface water depletion	0	30	100

Storage and handling of pollutants

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	25	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	25	100
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to groundwater	0	25	100
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to surface water	0	25	100

Wind and water erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Sheet and rill erosion	0	50	100
Wind erosion	0	50	100

Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Acquisition Process - Buy-Protect-Sell Transfer	LTAPBPST	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update	LTAPERSU	Easements
Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress	LTAPE	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	10	20
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	10
Resource Priorities	Default	35	40	50
Program Priorities	Default	40	45	50
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: NH FY23 ACEP-ALE General (Active)



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

Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: Applicability		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Located in NH?	Yes	--
	Otherwise	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Categories		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Located in NH?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Percent of the offered parcel containing prime farmland soils, soils of statewide agricultural importance, or locally important agricultural land.	<10% PUS/L	0
	10-33% Prime, Unique, Statewide/Locally Important	25
	34%-66% PUS/L	45
	67%-100% PUS/L	60
Presence of cropland, pastureland, grassland/hayland, or nonindustrial private forest land in parcel to be protected.	Cropland	10
	Pastureland	10
	Grassland/hayland	7
	Nonindustrial Private Forestland	3
Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture	Less than county average	0
	Equal to or greater than county average	5
Decrease in the percentage of acreage of farm and ranch land in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture.	Decrease in agricultural land use	10
	Increase in agricultural land use	0
Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland, pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture.	Decrease in percentage of acreage	5
	Increase in percentage of acreage	0
Percent population growth in the county as documented by the U.S. Census	Above NH average	10
	Below NH average	0
Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent U.S. Census.	Above state average	5
	Below state average	0
Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations.	YES	5
	NO	0
Proximity of the parcel to other permanently protected agricultural land.	Directly abuts protected agricultural land	20
	Is within 2.5 miles from protected agricultural land	15
	is between 2.6 and 5 miles from protected agricultural land	10
	Is greater than 5 miles from protected agricultural land	0
Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure.	Directly abuts other ag land OR is within 2 miles of ag infrastructure	10
	Is within 2 miles of other ag land OR between 2.1 and 5 miles from ag infrastructure	5
	is between 2.1 to 5 miles from other ag land OR between 5.1 and 10 miles from ag infrastructure	2
	Is greater than 5 miles from other ag land OR greater than 10 miles from ag infrastructure	0

Section: Program Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Does the parcel connect two or more protected parcels devoted to agricultural use?	YES	7
	NO	0
Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that is the eligible entity's own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.	<10%	0
	10-25%	5
	26-50%	15
	51% or more	20
Does the applicant meet the NRCS definition of a veteran farmer or rancher (VFR)?	YES	10
	NO	0
Did the applicant participate in the CRP Transition Incentives Program (TIP), and has the land included in the ACEP-ALE application come out of CRP within the last two years?	YES	1
	NO	0
Is land currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within one year and is grassland that would benefit from protection under 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).	YES	1
	NO	0
Land is grassland of special environmental significance that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.	YES	1
	NO	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
The parcel contains a site of cultural or historical significance that is currently listed or was formally determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places OR currently listed on the NH Department of Historic Resources or is included in the State Historic Preservation Office Inventory.	YES	10
	NO	0
Proximity of parcel to other permanently protected nonagricultural lands (such as forestlands and wetlands).	Directly abuts protected nonagricultural land	30
	Is within 2.5 miles	20
	is between 2.6 and 5 miles	10
	is greater than 5 miles	0
Percent of parcel that lies within any of the 4 Food Desert categories OR lies within 5 miles of any of the 4 Food Desert categories.	0-50% of parcel is within a Food Desert category	20
	51-100% of parcel is within a Food Desert category	40
	Parcel lies within 5 miles of any Food Desert category	10
	Parcel is greater than 5 miles from a Food Desert Category	0

Section: Resource Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Conservation practices are actively being applied or maintained to address identified resource concerns. Practices can include, but are not limited to: Riparian Forest Buffers, Soil Health Assessments (soil analysis, plantings to increase soil organic matter, crop rotations to minimize pest management, etc.), Nutrient/Grazing/Integrated Pest Management plans (being ACTIVELY applied), Storm Water Runoff (such as roof/ground gutters), Erosion Control (such as contour farming, no till seeding, cover crops, water bars, vegetated forest trails and log landings, etc.), Agricultural drainage systems have been maintained (grassed waterways, drainage ditches, etc.) allowing land to continue to be actively managed as cropland, hayland, or pastureland.	Riparian Forest Buffers	10
	Soil Health Assessments	10
	Nutrient/Grazing/Integrated Pest Management plans	10
	Storm Water Runoff	10
	Erosion Control	10
	Maintaining Agricultural drainage systems	10
	Other (including wildlife related practices)	10
	None	0
The eligible entity has elected to develop and periodically update an Agricultural Land Easement Plan (ALEP). NOTE: If the eligible entity agrees to develop an ALEP (including any component plans, except HEL plans) as a condition of selection and funding, the eligible entity is responsible for the development and maintenance of such plans.	YES	15
	NO	0
The project is located within a defined source water protection area.	In SWPA	20
	Otherwise	0
Majority of the offered area is mapped as the Highest Ranked Habitat in the NH Wildlife Action Plan (Greater than 50% Tier 1 Highest Ranked Habitat in NH WAP and/or Tier 2 Highest Ranked Habitat in Biological Region).	YES	20
	NO	0
Does the applicant meet the NRCS definition (see page 6 of form NRCS-CPA-41A) of a Beginning Farmer or Rancher, Limited-Resource Farmer or Rancher, or Socially Disadvantaged Farmer or Rancher?	YES	15
	NO	0