



# Ranking Pool Report

**Ranking Pool:** Utah Piute Russian Olive 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:** 11/07/2023  
3

## Land Uses and Modifiers

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

## Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Air quality emissions	0	1	100
Aquatic habitat	0	4	100
Concentrated erosion	0	3	100
Degraded plant condition	0	30	100
Field pesticide loss	0	2	100
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	100
Fire management	0	1	100
Inefficient energy use	0	1	100
Livestock production limitation	0	15	100
Pest pressure	0	20	100
Salt losses to water	0	1	100
Soil quality limitations	0	2	100
Source water depletion	0	5	100
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	1	100
Terrestrial habitat	0	5	100
Weather resilience	0	1	100
Wind and water erosion	0	3	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
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
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
Brush Management	314	Conservation Practices
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	Conservation Practices
Fence	382	Conservation Practices
Woody Residue Treatment	384	Conservation Practices
Riparian Herbaceous Cover	390	Conservation Practices
Riparian Forest Buffer	391	Conservation Practices
Stream Habitat Improvement and Management	395	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Wildlife Habitat Planting	420	Conservation Practices
Pasture and Hay Planting	512	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Grazing	528	Conservation Practices
Range Planting	550	Conservation Practices
Stream Crossing	578	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	Conservation Practices
Pest Management Conservation System	595	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	Conservation Practices
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management	644	Conservation Practices
Upland Wildlife Habitat Management	645	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 Piute Russian Olive SFP-FY24 (Active)

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

## Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: SFP-Piute RO Applicability		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is the PLU(s) located in Piute County	Piute County	--
	Otherwise	--
Does the EQIP schedule of operations include practices for the treatment of Russian Olive or Tamarisk?	YES	--
	NO	--

## Survey: Category Questions

Section: Piute County RO 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: SFP-Piute RO Program Priority		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Will the proposed project improve water quality by reducing TMDL impairments and is located:	Contiguous to or less than 1320 feet from the impaired waterbody?	200
	1321 to 2640 feet from the impaired waterbody?	100
	Greater than 2640 feet from the impaired waterbody	50
	No Impaired Water	0

## Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource Priorities		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Will the proposed project result in a change in the Grazing Response Index score of:	Range 3 to 4 - Pasture 6 to 8	200
	Range 2 to 2.9 - Pasture 4 to 5.9	150
	Range 1 to 1.9 - Pasture 2 to 3.9	100
	Range 0 to 0.9 - Pasture 0 to 1.9	75
	N/A	0