



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool: Utah Juab County Irrigation 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: 11/14/2023
3

Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Crop	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pasture	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Air quality emissions	0	5	100
Aquatic habitat	0	5	100
Concentrated erosion	0	5	100
Degraded plant condition	0	10	100
Field pesticide loss	0	5	100
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	100
Fire management	0	1	100
Inefficient energy use	0	5	100
Livestock production limitation	0	5	100
Pest pressure	0	5	100
Salt losses to water	0	1	100
Soil quality limitations	0	5	100
Source water depletion	0	25	100
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	1	100
Terrestrial habitat	0	2	100
Weather resilience	0	5	100
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	40	100
Classic gully erosion	0	30	100
Ephemeral gully erosion	0	30	100

Degraded plant condition

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant productivity and health	0	75	100
Plant structure and composition	0	25	100

Field pesticide loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Pesticides transported to groundwater	0	40	100
Pesticides transported to surface water	0	60	100

Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	15	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	25	100
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to groundwater	0	15	100
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to surface water	0	20	100
Sediment transported to surface water	0	25	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	20	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
Subsidence	0	5	100

Source water depletion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Groundwater depletion	0	25	90
Inefficient irrigation water use	0	55	90
Surface water depletion	0	20	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
Irrigation Pipeline	430	Conservation Practices
Irrigation System, Microirrigation	441	Conservation Practices
Sprinkler System	442	Conservation Practices
Irrigation Water Management	449	Conservation Practices
Obstruction Removal	500	Conservation Practices
Pumping Plant	533	Conservation Practices
Structure for Water Control	587	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 Juab County Irrigation 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	Lower Sevier	--
	Otherwise	--
Is the project within the goals of the Juab County Irrigation SFP?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Spending Plan Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Did the applicant self-certify as a beginning farmer or rancher, a veteran farmer or rancher, or NA on the NRCS-CPA-1200, Conservation Program Application?	Other	--
	BFR	--
	VFR	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Will the plan implement an advanced form of IWM that schedules irrigations based on measures of soil moisture.	YES	100
	NO	0
Will the plan implement an Intermediate form of IWM that schedules irrigations based on measures of soil moisture.	YES	75
	NO	0

Section: Program Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Will the plan implement an basic form of IWM that schedules irrigations based on measures of soil moisture.	YES	25
	NO	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource Priorities

Question	Answer Choices	Points
What is the expected change in Irrigation Efficiency (Use Irrigation Efficiency Tool)?	Greater than 50%	150
	45 to 49.99	100
	40 to 44.99	75
	35 to 39.99	50
	30 to 34.99	40
	25 to 29.99	30
	20 to 24.99	20
	15 to 19.99	10
	10 to 14.99	5
	5 to 9.99	2
	Less than 4.99%	0
Will the proposed project convert:	To Microirrigation	50
	From wild flood to pivot	50
	From wild flood to sprinkler	40
	From sprinkler to pivot	30
	none of the above	0