Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool	IRA-ACEP-WRE North Dakota FY20225				
Program	ACEP-WRE	**Pool Status**	Draft	**Tags**	IRA
Template	IRA ACEP-WRE	**Template Status**	Active	**National Pool**	No
Last Modified By	Jason Sieler	**Last Modified**	08/28/2024	**Include States**	ND (Admin)

Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Associated Ag Land	--	--	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Crop	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Forest	--	--	--	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 %**
Air quality emissions	10	10	60
Aquatic habitat	10	15	70
Concentrated erosion	0	5	60
Degraded plant condition	0	5	60
Field pesticide loss	0	5	60
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	60
Long term protection of land	10	15	70
Pest pressure	0	5	60
Source water depletion	0	5	60
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	60
Terrestrial habitat	10	15	70
Weather resilience	0	5	20
Wind and water erosion	0	5	15

Air quality emissions

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Emissions of greenhouse gases - GHGs	100	100	100

Aquatic habitat

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms	50	67	100
Elevated water temperature	0	33	50

Concentrated erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels	0	70	100
Classic gully erosion	0	15	50
Ephemeral gully erosion	0	15	50

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	75
Pesticides transported to surface water	25	50	100

Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	35	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	28	100
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to groundwater	0	4	15
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to surface water	0	4	100
Sediment transported to surface water	0	29	100

Long term protection of land

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Loss of functions and values	85	95	100
Threat of conversion	0	5	15

Pest pressure

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant pest pressure	100	100	100

Source water depletion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Groundwater depletion	25	40	60
Surface water depletion	40	60	75

Storage and handling of pollutants

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	45	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	55	100
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to groundwater	0	--	50
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to surface water	0	--	100

Terrestrial habitat

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates	100	100	100

Weather resilience

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Drifted snow	0	--	25
Naturally available moisture use	0	10	25
Ponding and flooding	0	45	100
Seasonal high water table	0	35	100
Seeps	0	10	25

Wind and water erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Sheet and rill erosion	0	85	100
Wind erosion	0	15	100

Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Wildlife Habitat Planting	420	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement	LTPPE	Easements
Structures for Wildlife	649	Conservation Practices
Long-Term Protection of Land - Maximum Duration Allowed by State Law	LTPMAS	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Easement	LTP30YE	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Contract	LTP30YC	Easements
Acquisition Process - Title Search	LTAPTS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Full Phase I	LTAPFP1	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal	LTAPA	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Update	LTAPAU	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review	LTAPTR2	Easements
Acquisition Process - Boundary Survey	LTAPBS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Closing Services	LTAPCS	Easements
Brush Management	314	Conservation Practices
Clearing and Snagging	326	Conservation Practices
Conservation Cover	327	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Burning	338	Conservation Practices
Cover Crop	340	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	Conservation Practices
Dam, Diversion	348	Conservation Practices
Well Decommissioning	351	Conservation Practices
Dike and Levee	356	Conservation Practices
Diversion	362	Conservation Practices
Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation	380	Conservation Practices
Fence	382	Conservation Practices
Field Border	386	Conservation Practices
Riparian Herbaceous Cover	390	Conservation Practices
Riparian Forest Buffer	391	Conservation Practices
Filter Strip	393	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Firebreak	394	Conservation Practices
Stream Habitat Improvement and Management	395	Conservation Practices
Aquatic Organism Passage	396	Conservation Practices
Dam	402	Conservation Practices
Grade Stabilization Structure	410	Conservation Practices
Land Clearing	460	Conservation Practices
Land Smoothing	466	Conservation Practices
Access Control	472	Conservation Practices
Mulching	484	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Site Preparation	490	Conservation Practices
Obstruction Removal	500	Conservation Practices
Pumping Plant	533	Conservation Practices
Range Planting	550	Conservation Practices
Drainage Water Management	554	Conservation Practices
Access Road	560	Conservation Practices
Trails and Walkways	575	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	Conservation Practices
Channel Bed Stabilization	584	Conservation Practices
Structure for Water Control	587	Conservation Practices
Nutrient Management	590	Conservation Practices
Pest Management Conservation System	595	Conservation Practices
Subsurface Drain	606	Conservation Practices
Surface Roughening	609	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	Conservation Practices
Underground Outlet	620	Conservation Practices
Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities	643	Conservation Practices
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management	644	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Upland Wildlife Habitat Management	645	Conservation Practices
Shallow Water Development and Management	646	Conservation Practices
Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt	647	Conservation Practices
Windbreak/Shelterbelt Renovation	650	Conservation Practices
Forest Trails and Landings	655	Conservation Practices
Constructed Wetland	656	Conservation Practices
Wetland Restoration	657	Conservation Practices
Wetland Creation	658	Conservation Practices
Wetland Enhancement	659	Conservation Practices
Forest Stand Improvement	666	Conservation Practices
Well Plugging	755	Interim Conservation Practices
Stream Crossing	578	Conservation Practices
Fuel Break	383	Conservation Practices
Woody Residue Treatment	384	Conservation Practices
Road/Trail/Landing Closure and Treatment	654	Conservation Practices
Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress	LTAPIE	Easements
Drainage Ditch Covering	775	Interim Conservation Practices
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	Conservation Practices

Ranking Weights

Factors	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Vulnerabilities	Default	5	10	10
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	10
Resource Priorities	Default	40	40	40
Program Priorities	Default	45	45	45
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: IRA-ACEP-WRE North Dakota FY2025 (Draft)

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**
Did the applicant apply for IRA ACEP-WRE enrollment?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
The proposed easement most closely aligns with which of the following IRA ACEP-WRE priorities?	Highly organic soils and high carbon mineral soils	--
	Restored and managed as native forest habitat	--
	Native forest habitat to be maintained as native forest habitat	--
	Agricultural cranberry bogs that is capable of being restored to native wetland habitat	--
	Drained or degraded montane wet meadows that are capable of hydrologic restoration.	--
	Ephemeral wetlands that will be restored to native grassland habitat	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: All Categories		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
1. Describe the self-certification of the applicants from the NRCS-CPA-1200?	Historically Underserved (HU), including Socially Disadvantaged Farmer or Rancher (SDFR), Beginning Farmer or Rancher (BFR), Veteran Farmer or Rancher (VFR), or Limited-Resource Farmer or Rancher (LRFR)	25
	Applicant is a covered producer participating in the CRP Transition Incentives Program (CRP-TIP)	5
	Not Historically Underserved	0
	Blank	0

Section: Priority Soils *		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**

Section: Priority Soils *

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. What percentage of the proposed easement area intersects with Priority Area 1 (red on the map)	Greater than or equal to 75%	40
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than or equal to 74%	20
	Greater than or equal to 25% and less than or equal to 49%	8
	Otherwise	0
2. What percentage of the proposed easement area intersects with Priority Area 2 (yellow on the map)	Greater than or equal to 75%	15
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than or equal to 74%	8
	Greater than or equal to 25% and less than or equal to 49%	3
	Otherwise	0
3. What percentage of the proposed easement area intersects with either Priority Area 1 and/or Priority Area 2?	Greater than or equal to 25% and less than or equal to 49%	5
	Intersects either Priority area	2
	Otherwise	0
4. What percentage of the proposed easement area will be restored to native forest as a planned practice under the Wetland Reserve Plan of Operations and/or is currently native forested habitat that will be maintained as native forest habitat?	Greater than or equal to 75%	10
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than or equal to 74%	7
	Greater than or equal to 25% and less than or equal to 49%	3
	Greater than or equal to 24%	0

Section: IRA-ACEP-WRE North Dakota Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
How cost effective is the application?	screening cost effectiveness <= 4.00	20
	screening cost effectiveness ranging from 4.01 - 8.00	15
	screening cost effectiveness ranging from 8.01 - 12.00	10
	screening cost effectiveness > 12.00	0
To what extent is this application leveraged	Applicants willing to accept of GARC Value 50%	10
	Applicants willing to accept of GARC Value 55%	8
	Applicants willing to accept of GARC Value 60%	6
	Applicants willing to accept of GARC Value 65%	4
	Applicants willing to accept of GARC Value 70%	2
	Applicants unwilling to accept less that GARC Value	0

Section: IRA-ACEP-WRE North Dakota Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
How many of the following items would be addressed by taking an easement on the offered land? Migratory birds and other wetland dependent wildlife; Water quality; Floodwater attenuation; Protection of open space; Native flora and fauna; and Education opportunities.	6 of the ACEP-WRE purposes achieved with potential easement.	40
	5 of the ACEP-WRE purposes achieved with potential easement.	25
	4 of the ACEP-WRE purposes achieved with potential easement.	10
	3 or less of the ACEP-WRE purposes achieved with potential easement.	0
How much of the offered land is productivite for growing crops?	Over 80 percent of the offered acres are planted annually.	10
	60-79 percent of the offered acres are planned annually.	8
	40-59 percent of the offered acres are planned annually.	4
	20-39 percent of the offered acres are planned annually.	2
	Less than 20 percent of the offered acres are planned annually.	0
Are there any environment threats that will require restoration practices other than the normal conservation restoration practices such as grass seeding, ditch plugs, etc.?	YES	0
	NO	10

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: IRA-ACEP-WRE North Dakota Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
How many acres of wetlands will be restored vegetatively?	5 or fewer acres of wetlands restored to wetland species.	0
	5.1 to 10 acres of wetlands restored to wetland species.	5
	10.1 to 15 acres of wetlands restored to wetland species.	10
	15.1 to 20 acres of wetlands restored to wetland species	15
	More than 20 acres of wetlands restored to wetland species.	20

Section: IRA-ACEP-WRE North Dakota Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Wetland Basins and Acres to be Hydrologically Restored	10 or fewer screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	0
	10.1 to 20 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	10
	20.1 to 30 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	15
	30.1 to 40 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	20
	40.1 to 50 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	25
	50.1 to 60 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	30
	More than 60 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	40
Degree of variability of wetlands and wetland types?	0 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	0
	0.1 to 15 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	10
	15.1 to 25 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	15
	25.1 to 35 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	20
	35.1 to 45 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	25
	45.1 to 55 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	30
	55.1 to 65 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	40
	More than 65 screening points attributed to hydrologically restoring basins and acres of wetlands.	50
State Geographic Area From USFWS Water Breeding Pairs Map	Breeding Pairs Map colors - Red or Yellow	30
	Breeding Pairs Map colors - Dark Green	20
	Breeding Pairs Map colors - Light Green	15
	Breeding Pairs Map colors - Beige	10
	Breeding Pairs Map colors - Dark Blue or Light Blue or South and West of Missouri River	5

Section: IRA-ACEP-WRE North Dakota Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Is offer adjacent to other protected wetlands	YES	15
	NO	0
Threatened and Endangered Species Occur in County	Eddy, McHenry, McKenzie, Richland, or Stutsman Counties	15
	Benson, Burke, Dunn, Emmons, Kidder, McIntosh, McLean, Mountrail, Oliver, Ransom, Sioux, Ward, or Wells Counties	15
	Burleigh, Divide, Foster, Logan, Mercer, Morton, Pierce, Renville, Sargent, Sheridan, or Williams Counties	10
	Bottineau or Rolette Counties	8
	Adams, Barnes, Billings, Bowman, Cass, Cavalier, Dickey, Golden Valley, Grand Forks, Grant, Griggs, Hettinger, LaMoure, Nelson, Pembina, Ramsey, Slope, Stark, Steele, Towner, Traill, or Walsh Counties	6
Is the offered property located in an 8-digit HUC identified by the ND Health Department as an impaired watershed?	YES	20
	NO	0
Will the easement's vegetative and hydrologically restored areas remain protected after the WRE easement has expired?	YES	15
	NO	0
How many of the following items does the offered land currently meet: Landscape features which allow feasible hydrologic restoration; Water levels that have negatively impacted agricultural productiveity most years; Include at least 80 acres of grass seeding; or Adjacent to other WRE/WRP/EWPP easements.	4 of the State hydrology questions met	15
	3 of the State hydrology questions met	10
	1 to 2 of the State hydrology questions met	5
	None of the State hydrology questions met	0

Detailed Assessments

Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Status