



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool: ID-FY24 ACEP-ALE GEN Big Game Migration

Program: ACEP

Pool Status: Active

States: ID (Admin)

Template: ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

Template Status: Active

Last Modified By Orië Winger

Last Modified: 12/08/2023

Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Associated Ag Land	--	--	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Crop	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
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 %
Degraded plant condition	0	15	50
Long term protection of land	40	75	75
Wind and water erosion	0	10	40

Degraded plant condition			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant productivity and health	0	50	100
Plant structure and composition	0	50	100

Long term protection of land			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Threat of conversion	100	100	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
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	10	20
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	10
Resource Priorities	Default	35	40	50
Program Priorities	Default	40	45	50
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: ID-FY24 ACEP-ALE GEN Big Game Migration-vI (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 ACEP-ALE Parcel in Idaho?	Yes	
	Otherwise	

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	
Is ACEP-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 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 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 area.	Core management area	
	Important management area	
	General management area	
	Otherwise	
3. 50% or more of the offered parcel is located in an IDFG Big Game Priority Area.	Yes	
	Otherwise	
4. Offered parcel falls within an IDFG Mapped Migration Route.*	Mapped Migration Route	
	Within 1 mile	
	Otherwise	
5. Parcel contains a source of perennial or intermittent streams, lakes, or ponds within the easement area. Select all that are applicable.	Mesic habitat that includes wet or semi-wet meadows, and/or irrigated pasture and hay meadows	
	Moist habitat associated with perennial rivers and streams, and/or permanent lakes	
	Moist habitat associated with intermittent or ephemeral rivers and streams, and/or seasonal lakes	
	Area contains no Mesic features.	
6. Number of sides the offered parcel borders sagebrush or rangeland habitat:	At least 3 sides or more	
	2 sides	
	1 side or none	
7. Offered parcel includes maintaining habitat for a Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) per IDFG identified species on the SWAP Slicer tool, or Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species per USFWS identified IPaC.	At-risk habitat identified that has experienced a disproportionately higher rate of loss in Idaho	
	At-risk habitat identified	
	None, or not applicable	
8. Parcel qualifies for protects grazing uses and related conservation values land eligibility category	YES	
	NO	
9. Parcel is within the boundary of a state Source Water Protection Priority Area (SWPPA).	Yes	
	Otherwise	