



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Utah Carbon Russian Olive And Tamarisk
Pool: Removal SFP-FY24

Program: EQIP

Pool Status: Active

States: UT (Admin)

Template: EQIP General National Ranking Template -
 Amended October 2023

Template Status: Active

Last Modified By: Davie Stokes

Last Modified: 11/29/2023
 3

Land Uses and Modifiers

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

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Air quality emissions	0	5	100
Aquatic habitat	0	5	100
Concentrated erosion	0	10	100
Degraded plant condition	0	5	100
Field pesticide loss	0	5	100
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	100
Fire management	0	5	100
Inefficient energy use	0	5	100
Livestock production limitation	0	5	100
Pest pressure	0	5	100
Salt losses to water	0	5	100
Soil quality limitations	0	5	100
Source water depletion	0	10	100
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	100
Terrestrial habitat	0	5	100
Weather resilience	0	5	100

Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wind and water erosion	0	10	100

Air quality emissions

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Emissions of airborne reactive nitrogen	0	20	100
Emissions of greenhouse gases - GHGs	0	20	100
Emissions of ozone precursors	0	20	100
Emissions of particulate matter (PM) and PM precursors	0	20	100
Objectionable odor	0	20	100

Aquatic habitat

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

Concentrated erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels	0	30	100
Classic gully erosion	0	35	100
Ephemeral gully erosion	0	35	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

Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
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

Fire management

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wildfire hazard from biomass accumulation	0	100	100

Inefficient energy use

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Energy efficiency of equipment and facilities	0	50	100
Energy efficiency of farming/ranching practices and field operations	0	50	100

Livestock production limitation

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Feed and forage balance	0	35	100
Inadequate livestock shelter	0	30	100
Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution	0	35	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	20	100
Concentration of salts or other chemicals	0	15	80
Organic matter depletion	0	20	100
Soil organism habitat loss or degradation	0	20	100

Soil quality limitations

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Subsidence	0	10	100

Source water depletion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Groundwater depletion	0	35	90
Inefficient irrigation water use	0	35	90
Surface water depletion	0	30	90

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

Terrestrial habitat

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

Weather resilience

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Drifted snow	0	20	100
Naturally available moisture use	0	20	100
Ponding and flooding	0	20	100
Seasonal high water table	0	20	100
Seeps	0	20	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
---------------	---------------	---------------

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Brush Management	314	Conservation Practices
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	Conservation Practices
Conservation Cover	327	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	Conservation Practices
Woody Residue Treatment	384	Conservation Practices
Riparian Herbaceous Cover	390	Conservation Practices
Riparian Forest Buffer	391	Conservation Practices
Pasture and Hay Planting	512	Conservation Practices
Range Planting	550	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	Conservation Practices

Ranking Weights

Factors	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Vulnerabilities	Default	10	20	40
Planned Practice Effects	Adjustment (D)	15	15	15
Resource Priorities	Default	20	50	60
Program Priorities	Default	5	5	15
Efficiencies	Default	10	10	10

Display Group: Utah Carbon Russian Olive and Tamarisk Removal SFP-FY24 (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
NRCS Team	Price- San Rafael	--
	Otherwise	--
Does the EQIP Schedule of Operations include practices and address resource concerns consistent with the Carbon County Russian Olive SFP	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Spending Plan Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
NRCS Team	Price- San Rafael	--
	Otherwise	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is the application in a priority area?	Gordon Creek	75
	Lower Wellington	60
	Helper	40
	Price	20
	SFP Boundary	0
	Otherwise	0
Are other partner agencies contributing funding for the project?	YES	125
	NO	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Will the application address re-treatment of Russian olive/Tamarisk after a partner organization completes the initial treatment?	YES	100
	NO	0
After Removal of Russian olive and/or tamarisk, will the application establish wildlife habitat or appropriate vegetation consistent with applicable ecological site descriptions (ESDs)?	YES	100
	NO	0