NH Ranking Criteria for NRCS Programs – Fiscal Year 2025

Application Overview

Any applicant may submit an application for participation in ACEP, EQIP, CSP, or RCPP. The NRCS State Conservationist or Area Director, in consultation with the State Technical Committee, Tribal Conservation Advisory Councils, Local Work Groups, and other stakeholders, has developed the following ranking criteria to prioritize and select applications that best address the applicable program purposes and priority natural resource concerns in **NH**.

The NRCS State Conservationist or Area Director will establish application batching periods and select the highest ranked applications for funding, based on applicant eligibility and the NRCS ranking process. In Fiscal Year **2025**, NRCS will use the Conservation Assessment Ranking Tool (CART) to assess and rank all eligible applications for NRCS conservation programs. The minimum threshold for continuous selection will be 50% of the total available points or 100 out of the 400 total available points. A manual calculation will allow conservation partners that don't have access to CART the ability to screen applications based on the following New Hampshire ranking criteria and forecast potential for continuous selection versus selection after established batching periods.

Inventory and Assessment in CART

CART is a decision support system designed to provide a consistent, replicable framework for the conservation planning process based on geospatially referenced information, client-provided information, field observations, and NRCS conservation planner expertise. CART is designed to assist NRCS conservation planners as they assess site vulnerability and existing conditions, and identify natural resource concerns for a unit of land.

CART assessments of existing management and conservation efforts are compared against conservation planning criteria thresholds to determine the additional level of conservation efforts needed to address identified natural resource concerns. NRCS uses the results to identify conservation planning activities for the client. NRCS also uses CART to consolidate resource data and program information to prioritize program delivery and report outcomes of NRCS investments in conservation.

In general, resource concerns fall into one of three categories for the assessment method used in CART to assess and document a resource concern:

- **Client Input/Planner Observation:** A streamlined list of options is presented to the planner to document the client's activities and the planner's observation of the resource concerns present. These observations are compared to the conservation planning criteria thresholds.
- **Procedural/Deductive:** A large group of resource concerns fall into this category and are assessed using a resource concern-specific evaluation tool or a list of inventory-like criteria. Due to the variability in State tools, assessment questions and answers will be broad in nature to allow States to align them with State conditions.
- **Predictive:** The remaining resource concerns are assessed using a predictive interactive model simulation. The CART systems attempt to replicate the outcomes related to the assessment threshold outcomes compared to the model outputs.

After identifying resource concerns and describing existing conditions, planned conservation practices and activities can be added to the existing condition to determine the state of the proposed management system. Practices that are needed to support primary conservation practices and activities are also identified, but do not add conservation management points to the total.

If the client is interested in financial assistance through an NRCS conservation program, the inventory and assessment information, along with client decisions related to conservation practice adoption, are directly and consistently transferred from the assessment portion of CART to the ranking portion of CART. Based on the transferred assessment information and the conservation practices proposed for implementation, CART identifies the appropriate program ranking pool(s).

Ranking in CART

In general, NRCS program ranking criteria uses the following guiding principles:

- Degree of cost-effectiveness of the proposed conservation practices and activities;
- The level of performance of proposed conservation practices and activities;
- Treatment of resource concerns or national priority resource concerns;
- Magnitude of the environmental benefits resulting from the treatment of resource concerns reflecting the level of performance of the proposed conservation practices and activities; and
- Compliance with Federal, State, local, or tribal regulatory requirements with regards to natural resources.

CART uses a set of National Ranking Templates developed for each NRCS program and initiative. The National Ranking Templates contain four parameters that are customized for each program to reflect the national level ranking criteria. The four parameters are:

1. **Land Uses** – NRCS has developed land use designations to be used by planners and modelers at the field and landscape level. Land use modifiers more accurately define the land's actual use and provide another level of specificity and help denote how the land is managed. Land use designations and modifiers are defined in Title 180, National Planning Procedures Handbook, Part 600.
2. **Resource Concerns** – The resource condition that does not meet minimum acceptable condition levels as established by resource planning criteria. This implies an expected degradation of the soil, water, air, plant, or animal resource base to the extent that the sustainability or intended use of the resource is impaired. Because NRCS quantifies or describes resource concerns as part of a comprehensive conservation planning process, which includes client objectives, human and energy resources are considered components of the resource base.
3. **Practices** – A specific treatment used to address resource concerns, such as structural or vegetative measures, or management techniques that are planned and implemented in accordance with applicable standards and specifications.
4. **Ranking Component Weights** – A set of five components comprise the ranking score for an individual land-based assessment. The five components are:
    a. **Vulnerability** – Site vulnerability is determined by subtracting the existing condition and existing practice scores from the thresholds. This score is weighted by ranking pool to address the resource concerns prioritized by that ranking pool.
    b. **Planned Practice Effects** – The planned practice effect score is based on the sum of the planned practice on that land unit that addresses the resource concern. This score is

weighted by ranking pool to address the resource concerns prioritized by that ranking pool.

c. **Resource Priorities** – National and State resource priorities are established to address the most critical land and resource considerations and are based on NRCS national and State priorities identified with input from national, State, and local stakeholders.
d. **Program Priorities** – National and State program priorities are established to maximize program effectiveness and advance program purposes and are based on NRCS national and State priorities identified with input from national, State, and local stakeholders.
e. **Cost Efficiency** – Summation of 'Planned Practice Points' divided by the log of the 'Average Practice Cost'.

NOTE: The points for vulnerability, planned practice effects, and cost efficiency are garnered from the assessment portion of CART.

NH created a State-specific ranking pool within the above-described National Ranking Template parameters. The State ranking pools contain a set of questions that are divided into the following sections – applicability, category, program questions, and resource questions. Ranking pool customization allows States to focus funding on priority resource concerns and initiatives identified at the State level with input from NRCS stakeholders. Each eligible application may be considered for funding in all applicable ranking pools by program.

NRCS Resource Concerns

The following table lists the 47 resource concerns NRCS uses during the Conservation Planning process.

Categories	NRCS Resource Concerns
Soil	1. Sheet and rill erosion
	2. Wind erosion
	3. Ephemeral gully erosion
	4. Classic gully erosion
	5. Bank erosion from streams, shorelines, or water conveyance channels
	6. Subsidence
	7. Compaction
	8. Organic matter depletion
	9. Concentration of salts or other chemicals
	10. Soil organism habitat loss or degradation
	11. Aggregate instability
Water	12. Ponding and flooding
	13. Seasonal high-water table
	14. Seeps
	15. Drifted snow
	16. Surface water depletion
	17. Groundwater depletion
	18. Naturally available moisture use
	19. Inefficient irrigation water use
	20. Nutrients transported to surface water
	21. Nutrients transported to groundwater
	22. Pesticides transported to surface water

	23. Pesticides transported to groundwater
	24. Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids, or compost applications transported to surface water
	25. Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids, or compost applications transported to groundwater
	26. Salts transported to surface water
	27. Salts transported to groundwater
	28. Petroleum, heavy metals, and other pollutants transported to surface water
	29. Petroleum, heavy metals, and other pollutants transported to groundwater
	30. Sediment transported to surface water
	31. Elevated water temperature
Air	32. Emissions of particulate matter (PM) and PM precursors
	33. Emissions of greenhouse gasses (GHGs)
	34. Emissions of ozone precursors
	35. Objectionable odors
	36. Emissions of airborne reactive nitrogen
Plants	37. Plant productivity and health
	38. Plant structure and composition
	39. Plant pest pressure
	40. Wildfire hazard from biomass accumulation
Animals	41. Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates
	42. Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms
	43. Feed and forage imbalance
	44. Inadequate livestock shelter
	45. Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality, and distribution
Energy	46. Energy efficiency of equipment and facilities
	47. Energy efficiency of field operations

New Hampshire FY2024 ACEP-WRE Ranking Criteria

Points for ranking questions in the program priority and resource priority sections cannot exceed a total of 400 points. National ranking requirements are noted in italics for each question below.

Program Questions – 100 points available.

1) Cost effectiveness to realize resource benefits

   Estimated Restoration Cost $/Acre:

   $0-25,000 = 15 pts

   $25,001-$100,000 = 10 pts

   >$100,000 = 5 pts

Cost effectiveness of enrolling the land to maximize the environmental benefits per dollar expended, applications that have a lower cost per environmental benefit ratio will receive higher rankings. Addresses cost effectiveness to realize resource benefits where purchase price may not be known for time of ranking.

2) The landowner and/or another person or entity is offering to contribute to the easement to leverage Federal funds. Financial contributions provide at least 25% of the easement purchase and restoration costs determined by NRCS.

   Yes = 10 points
   No = 0 points

Financial contributions for anything other than landowner donations require an MOU agreement to provide NRCS financial control. Reduced available points from prior years to emphasize program priorities for wetland habitats in other questions.

3) Extent to which program purposes would be achieved on the offered land. Select all that apply.

   a. Habitat protection for wetland dependent endangered, threatened species or federally at-risk or state species of concern of concern or species of greatest conservation need. Documentation required such as NHB data layer, other applicable GIS data layer, or field observation by NRCS or another qualified professional. Yes = 25 pts
   b. Protection and improvement of water quality and groundwater recharge. Preliminary restoration plan contains practices that will address water quality resource concerns or land offered for enrollment is located within a within a Source Water Priority Watershed. Yes = 15 pts
   c. Attenuation of floodwater. Offered area is located within a FEMA Flood Hazard Zone or contains an NHD mapped Water Body or a beaver impoundment that provides flood storage function and value. Yes = 10 pts
   Maximum points for meeting all criteria 3a-c = 50 points
   None of the above = 0 points

Extent to which ACEP-WRE purposes would be achieved on the offered land. Capacity of the wetland to improve water quality, water quantity benefits through increased water storage in the soil profile or through groundwater recharge Attenuation of floodwater flows and carbon sequestration.

4) The offered area contains the following percent of somewhat poorly to very poorly drained soils:

   >50% = 25pts

   20-50% = 10 pts

   10-20% = 5 pts

   <10% = 0 pts

Question required to address the productivity of the offered land. Emphasis is on protection of parcels with a greater percentage of wetland complexes.

Resource Questions – 300 total points available, half of which must be derived from Hydrology Restoration Potential Question #8

1) What is the proximity and connectivity to other permanently protected lands?
   a. Direct wetland/Riparian area connection – Yes = 40 points
   b. Direct upland connection – Yes = 20 points
   c. No direct connections – No = 0 points

   Maximum = 40 points

Proximity and connectivity to other protected habitats and extent of beneficial adjacent land uses. Adjacent conservations lands have beneficial land uses to support habitat protection.

2) Habitat will be restored to provide lifecycle needs for wetland dependent threatened, endangered, federally at-risk species, state species of concern or species of greatest conservation need.

Federal T&E species = 40 pts

State T&E species = 30 pts

Federally at-risk species = 20 pts

State species of concern or species of greatest conservation = 10 points

No = 0 points

Maximum = 40 points

Habitat that will be restored for the benefit of migratory birds and wetland-dependent wildlife, including diversity of wildlife that will be benefitted or life cycle needs that will be addressed. Extent and use of habitat that will be restored for threatened, endangered, or other at-risk species or number of different at-risk species benefitted. For example, the area contains both suitable wetland and upland habitat for threatened or endangered WLFW Northeast Turtle species.

3) Rare or exemplary native plant communities will be protected or restored.

   Yes = 10 points
   No = 0 points

Protection or restoration of native vegetative communities. Determined by NHB data or by field observation and consultation with NHB as appropriate.

4) From the NH Wildlife Action Plan:
   a. Greater than 50% of the offered area is mapped as Tier 1 Highest Ranked Habitat – Yes = 50 points or,
   b. Greater than 50% of offered area is mapped as either Tier 1 Highest Ranked Habitat or Tier 2 Highest Ranked Habitat in Biological Region – Yes = 25 points or,
   c. Less than 50% of offered area is mapped as either Tier 1 or Tier 2 Highest Ranked Habitat in Biological Region – Yes = 10 points

   Maximum = 50 points

Habitat diversity and complexity to be restored.

5) Offered area is located within a 303d Impaired Waters Area.

Yes = 10 points
No = 0 points

Addresses proximity to impaired water bodies and on-farm and off-farm environmental threats if the land being offered is or were to be used for agricultural production.

6) Hydrology Restoration Potential from Preliminary Restoration Plan. Resource concerns can be addressed to restore site hydrology and degraded habitat – Select all resource concerns that apply:

   a. Natural site hydrology and aquatic habitat will be restored to a degraded perennial stream. Yes = 50 pts (Approximately 1,000 or more linear feet of stream habitat improvement and management and/or barriers removed)

   b. Excessive bank erosion will be stabilized. Yes = 40 pts

   (Bank erosion from streams, shorelines, or water conveyance channels will be stabilized)

   c. Changes to land use and management will be applied to improve water quality and wildlife habitat by taking agricultural land out of active production. Yes = 30 pts (Nutrients and other

Non-Point Source pollution transported to surface water or groundwater will be reduced or eliminated)

d. Changes to land use and management will be applied to improve water quality and wildlife habitat by aligning forest management with wildlife habitat goals as the primary objective. Yes = 30 pts (degraded forest communities restored or alternate communities established for specific wildlife species needs)

Maximum = 150 points

Hydrology restoration potential, which must comprise at least 50 percent of the points for conservation benefits, should take into consideration:

- *The extent to which the original hydrology can be restored;*
- *The extent to which the potential hydrology restoration or enhancement practices will successfully provide hydrologic conditions that are suitable for the needs of the native wetland-dependent wildlife species that occurred in the area and are appropriate to support the wetland functions and values being restored or enhanced on the site;*
- *Physical site characteristics that affect hydrology restoration potential, including but not limited to—*
  - *Soil properties, such as soil texture, soil structure, and soil drainage classes;*
  - *Landscape features, such as geomorphic position, slope, and water table depths;*
  - *Flooding characteristics, including frequency, timing, duration, depth, and sources;*
  - *The source of the hydrology, the degree and type of hydrologic manipulation, existing connectivity and barriers to connectivity with hydrology sources;*
  - *As applicable, the reliability and availability of the water delivered through water rights, and the degree of reliance on such water rights to successfully restore hydrology.*

Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool	NH ACEP-WRE General FY2025 Ranking Pool				
Program	ACEP-WRE	**Pool Status**	Active	**Tags**	
Template	FY 2021 ACEP-WRE General	**Template Status**	Active	**National Pool**	No
Last Modified By	Brooke Stubbs	**Last Modified**	09/10/2024	**Include States**	NH (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	--	--	--	--	--
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 %**
Aquatic habitat	10	20	80
Concentrated erosion	0	5	70
Degraded plant condition	0	5	70
Field pesticide loss	0	5	70
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	70
Fire management	0	2	5
Long term protection of land	10	10	80
Pest pressure	0	5	70
Salt losses to water	0	3	5
Source water depletion	0	5	70
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	70
Terrestrial habitat	10	20	80
Weather resilience	0	5	20

Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wind and water erosion	0	5	15

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

Fire management

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wildfire hazard from biomass accumulation	100	100	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

Salt losses to water

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

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Pond	378	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
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
Grassed Waterway	412	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

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Nutrient Management	590	Conservation Practices
Pest Management Conservation System	595	Conservation Practices
Terrace	600	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
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

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	Conservation Practices

Ranking Weights

Factors	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Vulnerabilities	Default	10	25	50
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	20
Resource Priorities	Default	20	50	70
Program Priorities	Default	15	20	30
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: NH 2025 ACEP-WRE 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**	**Points**
Application is for land located within the State of NH	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Application is for land located within the State of NH	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Estimated Restoration Cost:	$0 - $25,000	15
	$25,001 - $100,000	10
	>$100,000	5

Section: Program Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Financial contributions provide at least 25% of the easement purchase and restoration costs determined by NRCS.	YES	10
	NO	0
Extent to which program purposes would be achieved on the offered land. Select all that apply.	Habitat protection for wetland dependent endangered threatened species or federally at-risk species or sate species of concern or species of greatest conservation need.	25
	Protection and improvement of water quality and groundwater recharge.	15
	Attenuation of floodwater.	10
	None of the above	0
The offered area contains the following percent of somewhat poorly to very poorly drained soils:	>50%	25
	20 - 50%	10
	10 - 20%	5
	<10%	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
What is the proximity and connectivity to other permanently protected lands?	Direct wetland/Riparian area connection	40
	Direct upland connection	20
	No direct connections	0
Habitat will be restored to provide lifecycle needs for wetland dependent threatened, endangered or at-risk species of concern.	Federal T&E species	40
	State T&E species	30
	Federally at risk	20
	State species of concern or species of greatest conservation need	10
	No priority species	0
Rare or exemplary native plant communities will be protected or restored	YES	10
	NO	0
Extent of NH Wildlife Action Plan habitat tiers	Greater than 50% of the offered area is mapped as Tier 1 Highest Ranked Habitat	50
	Greater than 50% of offered area is mapped as either Tier 1 Highest Ranked Habitat or Tier 2 Highest Ranked Habitat in Biological Region	25
	Less than 50% of offered area is mapped as either Tier 1 or Tier 2 Highest Ranked Habitat in Biological Region	10
Offered area is located within a 303d Impaired Waters Area	YES	10
	NO	0

Section: Resource Questions		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Resource concerns can be addressed to restore site hydrology and degraded habitat - Select all resource concerns that apply:	Natural site hydrology and aquatic habitat will be restored to a degraded perennial stream.	50
	Excessive bank erosion will be stabilized	40
	Changes to land use and management will be applied to improve water quality and wildlife habitat by taking agricultural land out of active production.	30
	Changes to land use and management will be applied to improve water quality and wildlife habitat by aligning forest management with wildlife habitat goals as the primary objective.	30

Detailed Assessments

Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Status