



Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool ALE 2025 Alabama

Program ACEP

Pool Status Draft

Tags

Template ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

Template Status Active

National Pool No

Last Modified By William Carson

Last Modified 09/26/2024

Include States AL (Admin)

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Water	N/A	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

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

Concentrated erosion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels	0	30	100
Classic gully erosion	0	30	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	33	100
Inadequate livestock shelter	0	33	100
Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution	0	34	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	20	100
Concentration of salts or other chemicals	0	15	100
Organic matter depletion	0	15	100
Soil organism habitat loss or degradation	0	15	100
Subsidence	0	20	100

Source water depletion

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Groundwater depletion	0	33	100
Inefficient irrigation water use	0	33	100
Surface water depletion	0	34	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
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update	LTAPERSU	Easements

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Type
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	5	20
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	10
Resource Priorities	Default	35	45	50
Program Priorities	Default	40	45	50
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: ALE 2025 (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
Does the ALE entity and parcel application meet eligibility requirements?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is application for a General ALE or Grassland ALE?	General ALE	--
	Grassland ALE	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program		
Question	Answer Choices	Points

Section: Program

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Percent of cropland, pastureland, and grassland in the parcel to be protected	91-100%	20
	81-90%	18
	66-80%	15
	51-65%	10
	34-50%	5
	<33%	0
Evaluate the ratio of the parcel acreage to average farm size in the county.	Ratio greater than 2.0	10
	Ratios between 1.0 and 2.0	7
	Ratio less than 1.0	0
Is application for a parcel that has grasslands of special environmental significance that will benefit from the protection under the long-term easement?	YES	10
	NO	0
Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland in the parcel to be protected.	Greater than 50%	25
	Less than 50%	0
Evaluate the percent DECREASE of acreage of farmland in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture.	Decreases of more than 15%	10
	Decreases of 10-15%	8
	Decreases of 5-10 %	5
	Decreases of 0-5%	3
	Decreases of less than 0%	0
Evaluate the percent DECREASE in the 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.	Decreases of more than 15%	10
	Decreases of 10-15%	8
	Decreases of 5-10%	5
	Decreases of 0-5%	3
	Decreases of less than 0%	0
Evaluate the Population density (population per square mile) of the county the parcel is in compared to the state population density, by dividing the county density by the state density.	Population density of county >3.0 times the state population density	15
	Population density of county 2.0-2.9 times the state population density	7
	Population density of county 1.0-1.9 times the state population density	4
	Population density of county is less than the state population density	0
Evaluate the Population Growth Rate of the county the parcel is in compared to the state growth rate Calculate by dividing the county growth rate by the state growth rate.	Growth rate of county >3.0 times the state growth rate	15
	Growth rate of county 2.0-2.9 times the state growth rate	7
	Growth rate of county 1.0-1.9 times the state growth rate	4
	Growth rate of county less than the state growth rate	0
Does the parcel have a Farm Succession or Business Plan in place at time of application?	YES	10
	NO	0

Section: Program		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
What is the proximity to other protected lands?	Adjacent or adjoining protected property as described above	15
	Within 1 mile of protected property	10
	Within 1 - 5 miles of protected property	5
	Greater than 5 miles from protected property	0
Evaluate the ALE parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to AGRICULTURAL use.	Links 2 parcels protected specifically for ag use	15
	Adjacent or adjoining a property protected specifically for ag use	7
	Does not link protected ag use areas	0
Evaluate the proximity of the parcel to other AGRICULTURAL operations and infrastructure to support continued ag use of parcel	GREATER THAN 500 acres of agricultural operations within a mile of parcel boundaries	15
	250-500 acres of other agricultural operations within a mile of parcel boundaries	7
	Less than 250 acres of other agricultural operations within a mile of parcel boundaries	0
Is the ALE parcel proposed currently enrolled in a CRP contract that is set to expire within a year?	YES	5
	NO	0
Does the entity provide proof of any cash match to the ALE transaction?	25% of the FMV of the ALE cash match provided	25
	10-24% of the FMV of the ALE cash match provided	15
	1-9% of the FMV of the ALE cash match provided	7
	<1 % or No cash match provided	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Resource		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is the ALE parcel in an identified as a local or state focus area rural greenway, designated scenic byway, or other environmentally sensitive/natural protection area (i.e. adjacent to scenic roadway, public water supply watershed, known T&E habitat, etc.)	YES	15
	NO	0
Does the ALE Parcel have any eligible historic or cultural resources that will be protected?	YES	15
	NO	0
Is a 303D stream located within the proposed ALE parcel?	Contains 303D listed stream	20
	No 303D listed stream	0
Is the applicant a member of a historically underserved group?	YES	50
	NO	0
Is the entity a Certified Entity, as defined by the ACEP manual, or have distinct experience with ACEP-ALE easements (demonstrated by greater than 5 enrollments in the 2014 Farm Bill)?	YES	25
	NO	0

Section: Resource		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is the entity applying for funding up to date on monitoring (specifically for FRPP/ALE) and/or no monitoring for any held easement is more than 2 years past due?	YES	25
	NO	0
Is the entity applying willing to use the ALE Minimum Deed Terms?	YES	25
	NO	0
Evaluate the Conservation plan for the ALE parcel and indicate if the Conservation Plan includes practices to address a variety of resource concerns	4 or more resource concerns addressed	25
	3 resource concerns addressed	20
	2 resource concerns addressed	15
	1 resource concern addressed	5
	No plan or no resource concerns to be addressed	0

Detailed Assessments

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