



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool FY'25 IRA-ACEP-ALE Oregon

Program ACEP

Pool Status Active

Tags IRA

Template IRA ACEP-ALE

Template Status Active

National Pool No

Last Modified By Eric Moeggenberg

Last Modified 09/04/2024

Include States OR (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	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Concentrated erosion	0	5	30
Degraded plant condition	5	5	50
Field pesticide loss	0	5	20
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	5	5	50
Livestock production limitation	5	5	50
Long term protection of land	40	40	75
Pest pressure	0	5	20
Salt losses to water	0	5	20
Soil quality limitations	5	5	50
Source water depletion	5	5	40
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	40
Terrestrial habitat	0	5	25
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	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

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

Terrestrial habitat

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates	0	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
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 - Full Phase I	LTAPFP1	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	15	15	15
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	5
Resource Priorities	Default	40	40	40
Program Priorities	Default	40	40	40
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: FY'25 IRA-ACEP-ALE Oregon (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
Did the applicant apply for IRA ACEP-ALE enrollment?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Which Target Area applies to the proposed easement area being offered for IRA ACEP-ALE?	Grasslands under threat of conversion	--
	Agricultural lands under threat of conversion	--
	Active agricultural rice cultivation on subsiding highly organic soils	--
	Null -This proposed easement area does not meet any IRA category	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Percent of prime, unique, and important soils in the proposed easement area to be protected?	Proposed easement area has greater than 80%.	36
	Proposed easement area has greater than 70% and less than or equal to 80%.	23
	Proposed easement area has greater than 60% and less than or equal to 70%.	17
	Proposed easement area has greater than 50% and less than or equal to 60%.	7
	Proposed easement area has less than or equal to 50%.	0
2. Percent of cropland, pastureland, grassland, and rangeland in the proposed easement area to be protected?	Proposed easement area has greater than 50%	25
	Proposed easement area has greater than 40% and less than or equal to 50%	17
	Proposed easement area has greater than 33% and less than or equal to 40%	8
	Proposed easement area has less than or equal to 33%	0
3. Ratio of the total acres of land in the proposed easement area to be protected to average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Greater than 2.0	12
	Greater than 1.0 and less than or equal to 2.0	9
	Less than or equal to 1.0	0
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 of greater than 10%	16
	Decrease greater than 5% and less than or equal to 10%.	7
	No decrease in percentage or decrease greater than 0% and less than or equal to 5%.	1
	Increase in the percentage of farm and ranch land	0

Section: Program

Question	Answer Choices	Points
5. Percent of population growth in the county as documented by the most recent United States Census.	Growth rate greater than or equal to 3 times the State growth rate.	16
	Growth rate greater than or equal to 2 and less than 3 times the State growth rate.	9
	Growth rate greater than or equal to 1 and less than 2 times the State growth rate.	4
	Growth rate of less than 1 times the State growth rate.	0
6. Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent United States Census.	Population density greater than or equal to 3 times the State population density.	18
	Population density greater than or equal to 2 and less than 3 times the State population density.	13
	Population density of greater than or equal to 1 and less than 2 times the State population density.	6
	Population density less than 1 times the State population density.	0
7. Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address farm viability for future generations.	Plan documented and performed by industry professional	5
	Plan	2
	No Plan	0
8. Proximity of the proposed easement area to other protected land, such as land owned in fee title by the United States or an Indian Tribe, State or local government, or by a nongovernmental organization whose purpose is to protect agricultural use and related conservation values; or land that is already subject to an easement or deed restriction that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural use or protects grazing uses and related conservation values; or lands adjacent to easements held by United States	Proposed easement area is directly adjacent (touching along a shared boundary) to a protected land boundary.	18
	Proposed easement area is within a 1 mile radius of a protected land boundary	11
	Proposed easement area is greater than a 1 mile radius and less than a 2 mile radius of a protected land boundary	7
	Proposed easement area is greater than a 2 mile radius and less than a 5 mile radius of protected land boundary	2
	Proposed easement area is greater than a 5 mile radius of a protected land boundary	0
9. Proximity of the proposed easement area to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure	Proposed easement area is directly adjacent (touching along a shared boundary)	11
	Proposed easement area is within 1 mile of protected land boundary	9
	Proposed easement area is greater than or equal to 1 mile but less than 3 miles in proximity	5
	Proposed easement area boundary greater than 3 miles in proximity	0
10. Proposed easement area ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use.	Proposed easement area links two non-continuous corridors of agricultural use	7
	Proposed easement area is a contiguous or proximal expansion of agricultural use area	4
	Proposed easement area increases an agricultural use area or is an isolated area of agriculture	2
	Proposed easement area does not increase an agricultural use area	0

Section: Program		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
11. Is the proposed easement area currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within a year, AND is the applicant a covered producer participating in the CRP Transition Incentives Program (CRP-TIP) and NRCS is evaluating the assessment during the two-year period covered by the CRP-1R?	YES	2
	NO	0
12. The proposed easement area is a grassland of special environmental significance that will benefit from the protection under the long-term easement	YES	7
	NO	0
13. Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland, pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county in which the proposed easement area is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Decreases greater than 15%.	12
	Decrease of greater than 10% and less than or equal to 15%.	7
	Decrease of greater than 5% and less than or equal to 10%.	5
	No decrease in percentage or decrease of greater than 0% and less than or equal to 5%.	3
	No decrease	0
14. Eligible entity contributes at least 10% percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement from its own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.	YES	9
	NO	0
15. Does the landowner have water rights secured for lands that are prime if irrigated only?	Yes	6
	No	-5
	Not applicable (no prime if irrigated soils)	0
16. The proposed easement is in an area with a threat of conversion:	High	50
	Moderately High	40
	Moderately Low	30
	Low	20
	Otherwise/No Data	0
16a. The proposed easement is in an area with a threat of conversion (Alaska, Hawaii or Puerto Rico):	Intersects a 1 mile buffer of Urban Area	50
	Intersects a Metropolitan Statistical Area	40
	Intersects a Micropolitan Statistical Area	30
	Otherwise	0
17. Landowner of proposed easement area is a historically underserved participant by NRCS defined criteria and self-certified on the NRCS-CPA-41A parcel application as a: limited resource farmer or rancher, socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher, or veteran farmer or rancher.	YES	25
	NO	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource		
Question	Answer Choices	Points

Section: Resource

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Select the percent of rangeland, pastureland, or land that contains forbs or shrublands to be protected on the proposed easement area that is currently devoted to grazing uses.	Proposed easement area has 75% or greater of rangeland, pastureland, or land that contains forbs or shrublands	15
	Proposed easement area has 50-74% or greater of rangeland, pastureland, or land that contains forbs or shrublands	7
	Proposed easement area has less than 50% of rangeland, pastureland, or land that contains forbs or shrublands	0
Threat of Grassland Conversion to non-agricultural use	YES	35
	NO	0
Eligible entity has demonstrated performance in managing and enforcing easements by monitoring and submitting 95 percent or more of its annual monitoring reports each year.	YES	15
	NO	0
Proximity of parcel to other permanently protected local, regional, state and federal lands such as parks, natural areas, forests, and grasslands that contributes to the habitat needs of species of concern in the area. Includes other non-public permanently protected conservation lands such as land trusts lands. Attach a map of the protected area in proximity to the parcel, list species and habitat types, and describe needs being met by protecting the parcel and by being in close proximity to other protected parcels.	Within 1/4 mile	25
	Within 1/2 mile	10
	Greater than 1/2 mile	0
Property is within 3 miles of an Oregon population center (an Incorporated City or a Census Designated Place)	YES	35
	NO	0

Detailed Assessments

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