



# Ranking Pool Report

**Ranking Pool:** ID-FY24 ACEP-ALE General

**Program:** ACEP

**Pool Status:** Active

**States:** ID (Admin)

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

**Template Status:** Active

**Last Modified By:** Diane French

**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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Developed Land	N/A	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
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	30
Soil quality limitations	0	5	50
Wind and water erosion	0	5	40
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	50
Field pesticide loss	0	5	20
Salt losses to water	0	5	20
Source water depletion	0	5	40
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	40
Degraded plant condition	0	5	50
Pest pressure	0	5	20
Livestock production limitation	0	5	50

## Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Long term protection of land	40	45	75

## 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

## Soil quality limitations

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
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

## Wind and water erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Sheet and rill erosion	0	50	100
Wind erosion	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

## Field pesticide loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Pesticides transported to groundwater	0	50	100
Pesticides transported to surface water	0	50	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

**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

**Degraded plant condition**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Plant productivity and health	0	50	100
Plant structure and composition	0	50	100

**Pest pressure**

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

**Livestock production limitation**

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

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Threat of conversion	100	100	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 General (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 General ALE Parcel in Idaho?	Yes	
	Otherwise	

## Survey: Category Questions

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

# Survey: Program Questions

Section: National Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	
1. Percent of 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)	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)	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)	Acreage decrease of greater than 15%	
	Acreage decrease of greater than 10%	
	Acreage decrease of greater than 5%	
	Acreage decrease of greater than 3%	
	Acreage decrease 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)	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	
7. Ratio of County population density vs statewide population density as documented by the most recent U.S. Census. (Census Bureau)	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	

**Section: National Questions**

Question	Answer Choices	
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	
1. 50% or more of the offered parcel is located within an Idaho NRCS designated Priority Area. (ID ACEP Priority Areas layer)	Yes	
	Otherwise	
2. At least 50% of the parcel to be protected is located in an area zoned for agricultural use, or a zoning classification consistent with agriculture, or a similar classification if located in government units without classification.	YES	
	NO	
3. Offered parcel includes environmentally sensitive features such as wetlands, riparian corridors, natural water bodies, or unique scenic views.	YES	
	NO	

**Section: State and Local Questions**

Question	Answer Choices	
4. Land parcel is enrolled and participates in a carbon sequestration program.	YES	
	NO	
5. Land parcel contributes products to local markets and restaurants in Idaho.	YES	
	NO	
6. Offered parcel includes maintaining habitat for Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) per IDFG identified species on SWAP Slicer tool, or listed species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) per USFWS identified within IPaC.	At-risk habitat identified that has experienced a disproportionately higher rate of loss in Idaho.	
	At-risk habitat identified.	
	None, or not applicable.	
7. Parcel contains historical or archeological resources that will be protected by the easement. Cultural resource must be recognized by SHPO, National or State Historic Register.	YES	
	NO	
8. Eligible entity has a strategic farmland protection plan with specific agricultural focal areas identified. Proposed ALE parcel must be included within a focal area.	YES	
	NO	
9. Eligible entity's average efficiency in closing NRCS easements. If no NRCS easements are held, entity must provide evidence of closing efficiency for other easements.	Closing efficiency is two years or under (average).	
	No experience in closing NRCS easements, but entity provided evidence of closing efficiency for other easements.	
	Average NRCS easement closing is over two years.	
10. Eligible entity will address the NRCS ACEP-ALE minimum deed terms (MDTs) as follows:	Minimum deed terms will be appended as written to the easement deed, OR an existing ALE deed template approved by NRCS for use specifically by the entity applicant will be used.	
	Minimum deed terms will be incorporated into the body of the easement deed, OR the entity applicant is using another entity's NRCS-approved ALE deed template.	
11. Entity will develop an Agriculture Land Easement Plan (ALEP) for this parcel.	YES	
	NO	
12. Parcel falls within a state Source Water Protection Priority Area (SWPPA). (ID Source Water Protection Priority Areas FY24 layer)	Yes	
	Otherwise	