



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool: FY23 VA ALE Gen. Prog.Agreement

Program: ACEP

Pool Status: Active

States: VA (Admin)

Template: ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

Template Status: Active

Last Modified By: Jennifer Templeton

Last Modified: 05/31/2023

Land Uses and Modifiers

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

Resource Concern Categories

| Categories | | | |
|--|-------|-----------|-------|
| Category | Min % | Default % | Max % |
| Concentrated erosion | 0 | -- | 30 |
| Degraded plant condition | 0 | -- | 50 |
| Field pesticide loss | 0 | -- | 20 |
| Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss | 0 | -- | 50 |
| Livestock production limitation | 0 | -- | 50 |
| Long term protection of land | 40 | 75 | 75 |
| Pest pressure | 0 | -- | 20 |
| Salt losses to water | 0 | -- | 20 |
| Soil quality limitations | 0 | 25 | 50 |
| Source water depletion | 0 | -- | 40 |
| Storage and handling of pollutants | 0 | -- | 40 |
| Wind and water erosion | 0 | -- | 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 | 34 | 100 |
| Inadequate livestock shelter | 0 | 33 | 100 |
| Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution | 0 | 33 | 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 - Environmental Database Records Search | LTAPERS | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update | LTAPERSU | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress | LTAPIE | Easements |

| Practice Name | Practice Code | Practice Type |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review | LTAPTR1 | Easements |
| Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review | LTAPTR2 | 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: FY23 VA ALE Gen. Prog.Agreement (Active)

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

Survey: Applicability Questions

| Section: Parcel located in Virginia | | |
|--|----------------|--------|
| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
| Does the proposed easement parcel fall within the boundaries of the State of Virginia? | YES | -- |
| | NO | -- |

Survey: Category Questions

| Section: Parcel located in Virginia | | |
|--|----------------|--------|
| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
| Does the proposed easement parcel fall within the boundaries of the State of Virginia? | YES | -- |
| | NO | -- |

Survey: Program Questions

| Section: Land Conditions | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Question | Answer Choices | Points |

Section: Land Conditions

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|---|--|--------|
| Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland? | 0 points for less than or equal to 50% | 0 |
| | 4 points for greater than 50% and less than or equal to 60% | 4 |
| | 8 points for greater than 60% and less than or equal to 70% | 8 |
| | 12 points for greater than 70% and less than or equal to 80% | 12 |
| | 20 points for greater than 80% | 20 |
| Percent of cropland, pastureland, or nonindustrial private forest land? | 0 points for 33% or less | 0 |
| | 5 points for greater than 33% and less than or equal to 40% | 5 |
| | 15 points for greater than 40% and less than or equal to 50% | 15 |
| | 20 points for greater than 50% | 20 |

Section: Census of Agriculture, USDA NASS

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|---|---|--------|
| Ratio of acres of parcel to average farm size in the county? | Ratio of 1.0 or less | 0 |
| | Ratio of greater than 1.0 and less than or equal to 2.0 | 10 |
| | Ratio greater than 2.0 | 20 |
| Decrease in the percentage of acreage of farm land in the county? | Decrease of 0% or less | 0 |
| | Decrease of greater than 0 and less than or equal to 5% | 1 |
| | Decrease of greater than 5 and less than or equal to 10% | 5 |
| | Decrease of greater than 10 and less than or equal to 15% | 9 |
| | Decrease of greater than 15% | 15 |
| | Decrease of greater than 20% | 20 |
| Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent pasture, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture (USDA , NASS, Census of Agriculture) | Decrease of 0% | 0 |
| | Decrease of greater than 0 and less than or equal to 5% | 3 |
| | Decrease of greater than 5 and less than or equal to 10% | 5 |
| | Decrease of greater than 10 and less than or equal to 15% | 8 |
| | Decrease of greater than 15% | 10 |

Section: Census of Agriculture, USDA NASS

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|---|--|--------|
| Percent population growth in the county as documented by the most recent United States Census (Census Bureau Home Page, www.census.gov) | Growth rate of equal or less than the State growth rate | 0 |
| | Growth rate greater than one and less than or equal to two times the State growth rate | 4 |
| | Growth rate of greater than two and less than or equal to three times the State growth rate | 7 |
| | Growth rate of greater than three times the State growth rate | 15 |
| Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent United States Census (Census Bureau Home Page) | Pop. density same as or less than the State population density | 0 |
| | Pop. density greater than one and less than or equal to two times the State population density | 5 |
| | Pop. density greater than two and less than or equal to three times the State population density | 10 |
| | Pop. density of greater than three times the State population density | 15 |

Section: Other National Program Questions

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|--|--|--------|
| Existence of a farm succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations. | No plan or plan prepared by professional more than 10 years old | 0 |
| | Plan prepared by industry professional equal to or greater than 10 years old | 5 |
| | Plan prepared by industry professional between 3 years but less than or equal to 5 years old | 10 |
| | Plan prepared by industry professional less than 2 years old | 15 |
| Proximity of the parcel to other protected land, such as compatible military 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 deed restriction that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural use. | Easement offer area (EOA) boundary greater than 3 miles from the protected land boundary | 0 |
| | EOA is greater than 1 mile but less than or equal to 3 miles from protected land | 4 |
| | EOA is within 1 mile of protected land boundary | 7 |
| | EOA boundary adjoins protected land boundary | 15 |
| Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure. Agricultural Infrastructure includes items that support the agricultural community such as transportation, implementation supplier, ag supplier of seed, herbicides, or fertilizers, elevator or cooperative groups, etc.) | Easement offer area (EOA) boundary is greater than 3 miles in proximity | 0 |
| | EOA is greater than 1 mile but less than or equal to 3 miles in proximity | 4 |
| | EOA is within 1 mile proximity | 7 |
| | EOA boundary adjoins | 15 |

Section: Other National Program Questions

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|--|--|--------|
| Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use, Proximal refers to the ALE acreages ability to create or provide a continuous protected area, Example 1 the New parcel is adjacent to Current protected area, making it larger, or 2 New parcel is adjacent to and connects two protected areas into one large one. Instead of two, there would be one large one. | Parcel does not increase a protected agricultural use area. | 0 |
| | Parcel is a contiguous or proximal expansion of agricultural use protected area. | 6 |
| | Parcel links two noncontiguous corridors of protected agricultural use. | 15 |
| Parcel is 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. | YES | 2 |
| | NO | 0 |
| Land is grassland of special environmental significance that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement. | YES | 2 |
| | NO | 0 |
| The grassland in the parcel will benefit from the protection under the long-term easement. | YES | 1 |
| | 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. | Cash is 10% or more. | 15 |
| | Cash is 5% or more. | 7 |
| | Cash is less than 5%. | 0 |

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: State Resource Questions

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|--|--|--------|
| The parcel is located in an area zoned for agricultural use. | YES | 10 |
| | NO | 0 |
| Eligible entity has demonstrated performance in managing and enforcing easements. Performance must be measured by the efficiency by which easement transactions are completed, or percentage of parcels that have been monitored annually, and the percentage of monitoring results that have been reported annually. (Cannot score points for both options: minimum deed terms addendum and certification.) | Submitted 100% of annual monitoring reports in the past 5 years. This includes providing information on any change in ownership to NRCS. | 10 |
| | Submitted annual monitoring reports ON TIME in the past 5 years. | 10 |
| | Completed a past ALE or FRPP acquisition within two-year initial contract period. | 10 |
| | Will attach the ALE minimum deed terms addendum as written, or use of an EPD-approved entity-specific ALE deed template. | 10 |
| | Eligible entity requested and received certification under ACEP-ALE and is operating as a certified entity, | 10 |
| Contains a historical or archaeological resource on the Local, State, OR National Register, OR designated as a Century Farm, AND will be protected by easement. | Yes | 20 |
| | Adjacent | 5 |
| | No | 0 |
| Diversity and At-risk species - Parcel contains a state or federal threatened or endangered species per Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) - Natural Heritage Data Explorer (NHDE). | YES | 15 |
| | NO | 0 |

Section: State Resource Questions

| Question | Answer Choices | Points |
|---|--|--------|
| <p>Geographic regions where the enrollment of particular lands may help achieve National, State, and Regional agricultural or conservation goals and objectives, or enhance existing government or private conservation projects.</p> | Governor's Conserve Virginia priority area | 15 |
| | Chesapeake Bay Watershed | 15 |
| | Area of Tribal significance, identified as a Virginia state-recognized Native American Indian Tribe through a letter to NRCS; | 15 |
| | Local government policy consistent with the purposes of the ACEP (cite the State or local government policy consistent with the ACEP); | 15 |
| | Designated Sentinel Lands in Virginia. | 15 |
| <p>Measures that will be used to maintain or increase agricultural viability, such as ...</p> | Succession plans | 10 |
| | Agricultural land easement plan (not including required highly erodible land conservation plans). | 10 |
| | Entity deed terms that specifically address long-term agricultural viability. | 10 |