



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool: FY 2024 ACEP-WRE NJ

Program: ACEP-WRE

Pool Status: Active

States: NJ (Admin)

Template: FY 2021 ACEP-WRE General **Template Status:** Active

Last Modified By: Katelyn Colon

Last Modified: 11/28/2023

Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Associated Ag Land	--	--	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Crop	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
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 %
Aquatic habitat	10	10	80
Degraded plant condition	0	10	70
Long term protection of land	10	35	80
Source water depletion	0	10	70
Terrestrial habitat	10	30	80
Weather resilience	0	5	20

Aquatic habitat			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms	50	100	100

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

Long term protection of land

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Loss of functions and values	85	95	100
Threat of conversion	0	5	15

Source water depletion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Groundwater depletion	25	40	60
Surface water depletion	40	60	75

Terrestrial habitat

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

Weather resilience

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Naturally available moisture use	0	10	25
Ponding and flooding	0	45	100
Seasonal high water table	0	35	100
Seeps	0	10	25

Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Brush Management	314	Conservation Practices
Clearing and Snagging	326	Conservation Practices
Conservation Cover	327	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Burning	338	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	Conservation Practices
Well Decommissioning	351	Conservation Practices
Fence	382	Conservation Practices
Woody Residue Treatment	384	Conservation Practices
Riparian Herbaceous Cover	390	Conservation Practices
Riparian Forest Buffer	391	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Firebreak	394	Conservation Practices
Stream Habitat Improvement and Management	395	Conservation Practices
Aquatic Organism Passage	396	Conservation Practices
Grade Stabilization Structure	410	Conservation Practices
Wildlife Habitat Planting	420	Conservation Practices
Access Control	472	Conservation Practices
Mulching	484	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Site Preparation	490	Conservation Practices
Obstruction Removal	500	Conservation Practices
Trails and Walkways	575	Conservation Practices
Stream Crossing	578	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	Conservation Practices
Channel Bed Stabilization	584	Conservation Practices
Structure for Water Control	587	Conservation Practices
Surface Roughening	609	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	Conservation Practices
Underground Outlet	620	Conservation Practices
Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities	643	Conservation Practices
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management	644	Conservation Practices
Upland Wildlife Habitat Management	645	Conservation Practices
Shallow Water Development and Management	646	Conservation Practices
Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt	647	Conservation Practices
Structures for Wildlife	649	Conservation Practices
Road/Trail/Landing Closure and Treatment	654	Conservation Practices
Forest Trails and Landings	655	Conservation Practices
Wetland Restoration	657	Conservation Practices
Wetland Enhancement	659	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Forest Stand Improvement	666	Conservation Practices
Acquisition Process - Appraisal	LTAPA	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Update	LTAPAU	Easements
Acquisition Process - Boundary Survey	LTAPBS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Closing Services	LTAPCS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Full Phase I	LTAPFP1	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review	LTAPTR2	Easements
Acquisition Process - Title Search	LTAPTS	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Contract	LTP30YC	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Easement	LTP30YE	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	10	20	50
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	20	20
Resource Priorities	Default	20	30	70
Program Priorities	Default	15	30	30
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: FY 2024 NJ WRE Ranking Pool (Active)

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

Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: Applicability Question		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is this application for WRE in New Jersey?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Categories		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is this application for General or Bog Turtle?	General WRE	--
	Bog Turtle WRE	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
What is the restoration cost per acre? The restoration cost is based on all of the area that will be restored, both wetland and buffer.	Under \$1,000 per acre (includes previously restored wetlands)	40
	\$1,000 to \$2,000	30
	\$2,000 to \$3,000	10
	Over \$3,000	0
Are there other financial contributions to the acquisition identified by an application proposal letter?	Partners or landowner(s) are contributing funds and/or in-kind services to the restoration or acquisition	5
	The project is part of a larger easement acquisition project	5
	No other financial contributions to the project	0
What percentage of the total easement site will be restored?	Over 90% of the site	30
	80-90%	25
	70-80%	20
	60-70%	15
	Over 50% of the site	10
	50% of the site or less (with a waiver)	0
What is the percentage of land use composition of the proposed easement?	Over 75% cropland acres	40
	Over 75% pasture acres	30
	Over 75% woodland acres	5
	Over 50% cropland acres, but less than 75%	20
	Over 50% pasture acres, but less than 75%	15
	None of the above	0
Are there on-farm and off-farm environmental threats if the land is used for the production of agricultural commodities?	YES	10
	NO	0

Section: Program Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Cost-effectiveness of restoration	Minimal management of hydrology or vegetation will be needed to maintain desired conditions after wetland is established (e.g. "walk-away" wetland; includes wetlands with drain plugs)	40
	Infrequent control of undesirable plants or animals	20
	Occasional Structural management/maintenance needed to maintain desired conditions (e.g. repair of water control structures)	10
	Intensive management/maintenance needed (e.g. yearly control of undesirable plants or animals)	0
Does restoration require any regulatory permits?	YES	0
	NO	10
Engineering Requirements	No engineering required beyond existing field office approval authority	25
	Some engineering required (earth moving only)	10
	Complex engineering required for one or more structures	0
Project pre-screening program feasibility	Does the landowner have an existing lien on the property, but the lien holder has consented to signing the subordination agreement (AD-1158)?	-25
	Is the parcel non-contiguous (e.g. divided by power-line easements, utility easements, access easements, roads, rivers/tidelands) or has other boundary configuration limitations that will reduce monitoring feasibility in perpetuity?	-10
	None of the above	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: General Special Considerations*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Does the project enhance long-term protection of previously restored wetlands that were not fully protected by an easement or similar protection?	YES	25
	NO	0
Site includes species identified by the Endangered/Threatened Layer AND will benefit those species	Federal T&E and Candidate	50
	State T&E	20
	State Species of Special Concern	5
	None of the above	0

Section: WRE Resource Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
----------	----------------	--------

Section: WRE Resource Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
What is the connectivity to permanently protected sites?	Project is immediately adjacent to an existing WRP/WRE easement	25
	Project is within 1/4 mile of an existing WRP/WRE easement	15
	Project is within a 1/4 mile of a permanently protected area providing wildlife habitat (such as a wildlife management area or natural area refuge)	10
	Project is adjacent to permanently preserved land through FRPP/ALE	5
	None of the above	0
What is the predominate soil drainage class within the restoration area?	Very poorly drained	35
	Poorly drained	20
	Somewhat poorly drained	10
	Moderately well drained	5
	Well drained	0
	Somewhat excessively well drained	0
	Excessively well drained	0
Proposed easement area (restoration area + buffer area = easement area)	Greater than 75 acres	30
	40 to 75 acres	20
	15 to 40 acres	10
	Less than 15 acres	0
Depth to seasonal high water table (predominant soil within the restoration area)	0"-6"	35
	7"-12"	20
	12"-18"	10
	greater than 18"	5

Section: Bog Turtle Special Considerations*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Impact of Erosion/Sedimentation, including impacts from agricultural runoff	None	10
	Moderate	5
	High	0
Severity of Existing/Historic Hydrologic Alterations: (ditching culverts/channel straightening, floodplain connection lost, pond excavation, outfalls from culverts, berms, impoundments, etc.)	None	10
	Moderate/Few	5
	Extreme/Many	0
Successional Vegetative Changes (amount and difficulty of treatment)	Low	15
	Medium	5
	High	0

Section: Bog Turtle Special Considerations*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Exotic Species Presence (amount and difficulty of treatment)	Low	15
	Medium	5
	High	0
What is the age of the active site? (based on date of last observation - USFWS will provide based on SOA data)	Less than or equal to 5 years	25
	Greater than 5 but less than or equal to 25	15
	Greater than 25 years	10
	There are no observations from this site, but it is adjacent to an extant site or between extant sites.	5
	None of the above	0
NRCS standardized bog turtle site prioritization assessment (provided by NJDEP-ENSP)	Good	25
	Fair	10
	Poor	5