



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking 1979 RCPP Entity-Held Easement Parcel
Pool: Contracts FY24

Program: RCPP18

Pool Status: Active

States: UT (Admin)

Template: RCPP 2018 Entity Held Easement Activity
 ver 1.0 FY 21-22

Template Status: Active

Last Modified By: Sara Saunders

Last Modified: 12/06/2023

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	--	--	--	--	--
Pasture	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Range	--	--	N/A	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Water	N/A	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic habitat	0	10	70
Degraded plant condition	0	10	70
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	10	70
Long term protection of land	30	60	100
Terrestrial habitat	0	10	70

Aquatic habitat			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms	0	50	100
Elevated water temperature	0	50	100

Degraded plant condition			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %

Degraded plant condition

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

Long term protection of land

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Loss of functions and values	0	50	100
Threat of conversion	0	50	100

Terrestrial habitat

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates	0	100	100

Practices


Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress	LTAPIE	Easements
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	45
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	45
Resource Priorities	Default	25	45	65

Factors	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Program Priorities	Default	25	45	65
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: 1979 FY24 EHE Parcel Contracts (Active)

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

Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: Geospatial		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Are the planned land units within the RCPP project boundary?	Within project boundary	--
	Otherwise	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: PPA Selection		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
The PPA identifies preselected and non-preselected parcels, and this parcel contract application is for?	Preselected Parcel	--
	Non-preselected Parcel	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program Questions*		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Application directly addresses one or more resource concerns for which outcome metrics have been included in the PPA Attachment E?*	Yes, there are outcome metrics included for the addressed resource concerns.	96
	No, there are no outcome metrics included for the addressed recourse concerns.	0
PPA exhibits identify direct relationship between proposed entity-held easement activities and partner contributions, and application directly leverages RCPP funding with partner contributions.	Cash match provided by eligible entity for payment of easement compensation to the landowner.	96
	No cash match provided by eligible entity for payment of easement compensation to the landowner.	0
Application or applicant meets HU requirements or criteria.	Yes, application or applicant meets HU requirements.	8
	No, application or applicant does not meet HU requirements.	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource Questions*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Does this application prioritize the health and function of the Weber and Provo Rivers?	Yes, this application supports the health and function of these watersheds.	200
	No, this application is not within these watersheds.	0