



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool FY 25 ACEP ALE Ranking Pool MA

Program ACEP

Pool Status Active

Tags

Template ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

Template Status Active

National Pool No

Last Modified By Natashaia Sawabi

Last Modified 09/06/2024

Include States MA (Admin)

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
Degraded plant condition	0	5	50
Field pesticide loss	0	5	20
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	50
Livestock production limitation	0	5	50
Long term protection of land	40	45	75
Pest pressure	0	5	20
Salt losses to water	0	5	20
Soil quality limitations	0	5	50
Source water depletion	0	5	40
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	40

Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wind and water erosion	0	5	40

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	100	100
Plant structure and composition	0	--	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

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	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

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

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

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
Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement	LTPPE	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - Maximum Duration Allowed by State Law	LTPMAS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update	LTAPERSU	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review	LTAPTR2	Easements
Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress	LTAPIE	Easements
Acquisition Process - Buy-Protect-Sell Transfer	LTAPBPST	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: FY 25 ACEP ALE (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	Points
This assessment seeks to protect agricultural lands with an ACEP-ALE easement or 30-year contract?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is this assessment located within the state of Massachusetts?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: National Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
National 2: Percent of total offered acres in the following land uses: cropland, pastureland, grassland, or rangeland.	Greater than 90%	30
	Greater than 75% and less than or equal to 90%	20
	Greater than 50% and less than or equal to 75%	10
	Less than or equal to 50%	0
National 1: Percent (acres) of parcel containing prime farmland soils, soils of statewide or unique agricultural importance, or locally important agricultural land	Greater than 90%	75
	Greater than 80% and less than or equal to 90%	60
	Greater than 70% and less than or equal to 80%	45
	Greater than 60% and less than or equal to 70%	30
	Greater than 50% and less than or equal to 60%	10
	Less than 50%	0
National 3: Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture.	Greater than 2:1	20
	Greater than 1:1 and less than or equal to 2:1	10
	Less than 1:1	0
National 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.	More than 15%	5
	More than 10% and less than or equal to 15%	4
	More than 5% and less than or equal to 10%	3
	More than 0% and less than or equal to 5%	2
	0% or less	1
National 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.	Decrease	1
	0% or Increase	0
National 6: Percent population growth in the county as documented by the U.S. Census.	Greater than State Rate	3
	Less than the State Rate	0
National 7: Ratio of county population density (population per square mile) versus statewide population density based on the most recent U.S. census. (www.census.gov)	Ratio greater than the or equal state population density	3
	Ratio less than the state population density	0
National 8: Landowner(s) are following a formal business plan, submitted with the application:	YES	2
	NO	0
National 9: Proximity of the parcel to other protected land within 1 mile radius.	> 50 acres or equal to acres of protected land within 1 radius	10
	< 50 acres of protected land within 1 mile radius	0

Section: National Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
National 10: Proximity of parcel to other agricultural operations or infrastructure. Driving distance along roadways from the location of the agricultural operation to the parcel.	100 acres or more of ag land/infrastructure w/in 2 mile of parcel	15
	50-100 acres w/in 2 mile	10
	less than 50 acres of ag land/infrastructure w/in 2 mile of parcel	5
National 11: Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or adjacent agricultural easements.	Parcel links two agricultural easements	20
	Parcel expands protected agricultural land	10
	Parcel is non-contiguous to an agricultural easement	0
National 12: Parcel is currently enrolled in a CRP contract that is set to expire within a year and is a grassland that would be protected by the easement.	YES	5
	NO	0
National 13: Parcel is a grassland of special environmental significance that will benefit from the protection under the long-term easement.	YES	1
	NO	0
National 14: Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that is the eligible entity own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner AND comes from sources other than the landowner.	Entity is contributing greater than 50% of its own cash resources.	10
	Entity is contributing equal to or less than 50% but greater than 30% of its own cash resources.	7
	Entity is contributing equal to or less than 30% but greater than or equal to 10% of its own cash resources.	3
	Entity is contributing less than 10% of its own cash resources.	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: State Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
State 1: Loss of Farmland between the 2012 and 2017 (Ag Census). MA average = 6.1% decrease. Loss of Farmland is county based.	Greater than 10% decrease	10
	More than 5% and less than or equal to 10%	6
	More than 0% and less than or equal to 5% decrease	3
	an increase of farmland	0
State 2: The parcel is located in an area zoned for agricultural use or a right to farm community.	YES	15
	NO	0
State 3: Landowner(s) offer diversification in agricultural products, i.e. multiple farm sectors represented:	Three or more farm sectors, such as dairy, maple, vegetables	30
	Two different agricultural sectors, such as greenhouse & orchard	20
	One farm sector or ag. product	10
State 4: Parcel is located in a food desert area/food access area according to USDA- ERS Food Access Research Atlas (https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-access-research-atlas/go-to-the-atlas) (Including all Low Income AND Low Access Layers (2019) any of the 4 measures)	YES	--
	NO	--

Section: State Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
State 5: Protecting the parcel provides multifunctional benefits of farm and ranch land protection or improvement, such as: Are landowners a historically underserved group, small scale farmer, limited resource farmer, new or beginning farmer or rancher, or veteran landowner?	YES	15
	NO	0
State 6: Parcel qualifies for land that furthers a State or Local Policy eligibility- entities must document how the State or local policy is consistent with the purposes of ACEP-ALE and how preservation of the parcel is consistent with that policy.	YES	15
	NO	0
State 7: The parcel is located within a MA Source Water Priority Areas polygon:	YES	10
	NO	0
State 8: Proposed area is one contiguous parcel, not including bisection by a public way	YES	15
	NO	0
State 9: Cooperating Entitys average efficiency closing NRCS easements.	Under or equal to 2 years	20
	Over 2 years	0
State 10: In the past year, Entity has met the following criteria:	annual monitoring of 95% of parcels	20
	annual monitoring of 75% of parcels	10
	None of the above	0
State 11: Eligible Entity has failed to enforce an FPP, FRPP, or ACEP-ALE funded easement or has not abided by the terms of the easement.	YES	0
	NO	20
State 12: Property will protect Federal or State listed at risk species and or habitat types	YES	15
	NO	0
State 13: Parcel boundary changes, excluding minor changes from a survey	Minus 20 points after application is submitted	-20
	No changes	0

Detailed Assessments

Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Status
------	------	--------------	--------