



# Ranking Pool Report

**Ranking Pool:** ID-FY24 ACEP-ALE GSS-SGI v.1

**Program:** ACEP

**Pool Status:** Active

**States:** ID (Admin)

**Template:** ACEP-ALE GSS  
(Program Agreements)

**Template Status:** Active

**Last Modified By** Diane French

**Last Modified:** 12/13/2023

## Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Associated Ag Land	--	--	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Crop	--	--	--	x	--	--	--	--	--	--
Farmstead	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Forest	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Other Rural Land	--	--	--	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 %
Concentrated erosion	0	5	20
Degraded plant condition	5	5	50
Field pesticide loss	0	5	20
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	50
Livestock production limitation	5	5	50
Long term protection of land	35	40	75
Pest pressure	0	5	40
Salt losses to water	0	5	20
Soil quality limitations	0	5	45
Source water depletion	0	5	40
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	25
Terrestrial habitat	0	5	40

## Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wind and water erosion	0	5	10

## Concentrated erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels	0	20	100
Classic gully erosion	0	40	100
Ephemeral gully erosion	0	40	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

## Livestock production limitation

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Feed and forage balance	0	40	100
Inadequate livestock shelter	0	15	100
Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution	0	45	100

## Long term protection of land

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Threat of conversion	100	100	100

**Pest pressure**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Plant pest pressure	0	100	100

**Salt losses to water**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Salts transported to groundwater	0	50	100
Salts transported to surface water	0	50	100

**Soil quality limitations**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Aggregate instability	0	15	100
Compaction	0	15	100
Concentration of salts or other chemicals	0	15	100
Organic matter depletion	0	20	100
Soil organism habitat loss or degradation	0	20	100
Subsidence	0	15	100

**Source water depletion**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Groundwater depletion	0	35	100
Inefficient irrigation water use	0	35	100
Surface water depletion	0	30	100

**Storage and handling of pollutants**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
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**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates	0	100	100

**Wind and water erosion**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Sheet and rill erosion	0	50	100

## Wind and water erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wind erosion	0	50	100

## Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update	LTAPERSU	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	15	20
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	10
Resource Priorities	Default	35	40	50
Program Priorities	Default	40	40	50
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

## Display Group: ID-FY24 ACEP-ALE GSS-SGI v.2 (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	
Is at least 51% of ACEP-ALE GSS-SGI offered parcel within the Sage Grouse Project boundary?	Yes	
	Otherwise	

## Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	
Is ALE Parcel in Idaho??	Yes	
	Otherwise	

**Survey: Program Questions**

Section: National Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	
1. Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland soil in the parcel to be protected?	Greater than 80%	
	Greater than 70%	
	Greater than 60%	
	Greater than 50%	
	Less than 49%	
2. Percent of cropland, range land, grassland, historic grassland, pastureland, or nonindustrial private forest land in parcel to be protected	Greater than 50%	
	Greater than 40%	
	Greater than 33%	
	Less than 32%	
3. Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average farm size in the county based on USDA Census of Agriculture. (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Ratio greater than 2	
	Ratio greater than 1	
	Ratio less than 0.99	
4. Decrease in the percentage of acreage of farm and ranch land in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture. (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Decrease greater than 15 percent	
	Decrease greater than 10 percent	
	Decrease greater than 5 percent	
	Decrease less than 5 percent	
5. Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland, pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture. (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Acreage decreases of greater than 15%	
	Acreage decreases of greater than 10%	
	Acreage decreases of greater than 5%	
	Acreage decreases of greater than 3%	
	Acreage decreases of less than 2.99%	
6. Ratio of population growth in the county vs statewide population growth as documented by the U.S. Census (Census Bureau Home Page)	County growth rate is more than 3 times the State growth rate	
	County growth rate is more than 2 times the State growth rate	
	County growth rate is more than 1 times the State growth rate	
	County growth rate is less than .99 times the State growth rate	

Section: National Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	
7. Ratio of County population density vs statewide population density as documented by the most recent U.S. Census (Census Bureau Home Page)	County population density is more than 3 times the State density	
	County population density is more than 2 times the State density	
	County population density is more than 1 times the State density	
	County population density is less than 0.99 times the State density	
8. Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations.	Plan is documented and developed by an industry professional	
	Plan is documented	
	No plan is documented	
9. Proximity of the parcel to other protected land that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural use or protects grazing uses and related conservation values.	Adjacent to other protected land	
	Within 1 mile of other protected land	
	Within 3 miles of other protected land	
	None of the above	
10. Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure	Adjacent to other agriculture operations and infrastructure	
	Within 1 mile of other agriculture operations and infrastructure	
	Within 3 miles of other agriculture operations and infrastructure	
	None of the above	
11. Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use.	Links two noncontinuous corridors of protected agriculture use	
	A contiguous or proximal expansion of protected agriculture use	
	None of the above	
12. The land is currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within one year and is grassland that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.	YES	
	NO	
13. Land is grassland of special environmental significance that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.	YES	
	NO	
14. Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that is the eligible entity cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.	Entity contributes 50% of FMV	
	Entity contributes 25-49% of FMV	
	Entity contributes 10-24% of FMV	
	Entity contributes less than 9.99% of FMV	

**Survey: Resource Questions**

Section: State and Local Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	

**Section: State and Local Questions**

Question	Answer Choices	
1. 50% or more of the offered parcel is located within a designated Idaho ACEP Priority Area (ID ACEP Priority Areas layer).	Yes	
	Otherwise	
2. 50% or more of the offered parcel is located within a State-of-Idaho Sage-grouse management areas for grasslands of special significance	Core management area	
	Important management area	
	General management area	
	Otherwise	
3. 50% or more of the offered parcel located in a IDFG Big Game Priority Area.	Yes	
	Otherwise	
4. Offered parcel falls within an IDFG Mapped Migration Route. *	IDFG Mapped Migration Route	
	Otherwise	
5. The offered parcel contains a majority of which Mesic and Riparian feature?	Mesic habitat associated with wet-meadows, springs, seeps, or small stream riparian areas supporting herbaceous and small wood vegetation that provides late season brood rearing habitat for sage grouse.	
	Moist habitat associated with natural lakes, ponds, or marshes	
	Ephemeral streams or riparian areas associated with large streams or rivers supporting trees and other riparian vegetation	
	Area contains no Mesic features	
6. Composition of native vegetation in the offered area is:	Greater than 75%	
	Greater than 50%	
	Greater than 25%	
	Less than 24.9%	
7. A majority, 51% or more, of the offered parcel area slopes are less than 30%	YES	
	NO	
8. Entity will develop a Grasslands Management Plan for this parcel.	YES	
	NO	
9. Offered acres border intact sagebrush rangelands on at least three sides.	YES	
	NO	
10. Offered acres are part of an active livestock grazing operation	YES	
	NO	
11. Based on IDFG predictive models, parcel provides one or more of the Sage Grouse annual habitat requirements: Winter, Spring, and Late Brood Rearing. Select all that apply.	Winter	
	Spring	
	Late Brood Rearing	
	Otherwise	

**Section: State and Local Questions**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer Choices</b>	
12. According to the Rangeland Analysis Platform, a majority 51% or more of the offered parcel acres are within a Resilience and Resistance class as follows:	High	
	Moderate	
	Low	
	Otherwise	
13. Parcel is within the boundary of a state Source water Protection Priority Area (SWPPA).	Yes	
	Otherwise	