

# USDA Ranking Pool Report

**Ranking Pool** FY25 ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

**Program** ACEP

**Pool Status** Active

**Tags**

**Template** ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

**Template Status** Active

**Existing Practice Included** No

**Last Modified By** Jason Sieler

**Last Modified** 08/13/2024

**National Pool** No

**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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
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	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	20	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	20	100
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to groundwater	0	20	100
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to surface water	0	40	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 Narratives	Practice Type
Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement	LTPPE	00N	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - Maximum Duration Allowed by State Law	LTPMAS	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update	LTAPERSU	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review	LTAPTR2	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress	LTAPIE	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Buy-Protect-Sell Transfer	LTAPBPST	00N	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: FY25 ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements) (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
Located in ND	Located in ND	--
	Otherwise	--

## Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
County location	County location	--
	Otherwise	--

## Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland in the parcel to be protected?	50% or less	0
	51-60%	4
	61-70%	8
	71-80%	12
	Greater than 80%	16
Are landowners a historically underserved group, small scale farmer, limited resource landowner, new or beginning farmer or rancher or veteran landowner?	YES	3
	NO	0
Percent of cropland, pastureland, grassland, and rangeland in the parcel to be protected?	33% or less	0
	33-40%	4
	40-50%	8
	More than 50%	16
Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to acreage farm size in the county?	1.0 or less	0
	1.1- 2.0	5
	more than 2.0	10
Decrease in the percent of Ag Land, excluding Cropland, Pastureland and Woodland?	No decrease or less than 1%	0
	Decrease of 1-5%	1
	Decrease of 5-10%	5
	Decrease of 11-15%	9
	Decrease of more than 15%	10
Percent population growth in the county?	Growth rate of less than 1 times the Sate growth rate	0
	Growth rate of 1.1-2 times the State growth rate	4
	Growth rate of 2.1 - 3 times the State growth rate	7
	Growth rate of more than 3 times the Sate growth rate	10
County population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent United States Census?	County population density less than 1 times the Sate population	0
	County population density of greater than 1 and less than or equal to 2 times the Sate population density	4
	County population density of greater than 2 and less than or equal to 3 times the State population density	7
	County population density of greater than 3 times the state population density	15

## Section: Program

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address farm viability for future generations?	No Plan	0
	Existing plan	7
	Existing plan documented and performed by an industry professional	15
Proximity of the parcel to other protected land, including military installations?	Parcel greater than 3 miles from the protected land boundary	0
	Parcel is greater than 1 mile but less than 3 miles from protected land boundary	4
	Parcel is within 1 mile of protected land boundary	7
	Parcel boundary adjoins protected land boundary	15
Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure?	Parcel greater than 3 miles from other ag. Operations and infrastructure	0
	Parcel is 1 mile or greater, but less than 3 miles from other ag. Operations and infrastructure	4
	Parcel is with in 1 mile from other ag. Operations and infrastructure	7
	Parcel adjoins other ag. Operations and infrastructure	15
Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous acres devoted to agricultural use?	Parcel links two noncontinuous corridors of protected agricultural use	15
	Parcel expands agricultural use protected area	6
	Parcel does not increase a protected agricultural use area	0
Parcel contains historical or archaeological resources that will be protected by easement area?	YES	15
	NO	0
The grassland in the parcel will benefit from the protection under the long-term easement for example, Grassland of Special Environmental Significance?	YES	15
	NO	0
Will the eligible cooperating entity pay over 50% of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement with its own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner?	YES	15
	NO	0
Currently enrolled in a CRP contract set to expire within a year and is grassland that would benefit from protection?	YES	15
	NO	0

## Survey: Resource Questions

## Section: Resource

Question	Answer Choices	Points
----------	----------------	--------

## Section: Resource

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Proximity to protected habitats such as WRE, WRP, EWP, EWPR, GRP, state owned Game Production Areas, USFWS Waterfowl Production Areas, Forest Service Grasslands, and military installations.	Adjacent to Offered area	35
	Within 0.5 miles of offered area	20
	0.6 - 1.0 miles from offered area	10
	Greater than 1 mile from offered area	5
Habitat Biodiversity ?	Offered are is 1,000 acres or more	35
	Offered are is 999-500 acres	20
	Offered are is 499-250 acres	10
	Offered are is less than 250 acres	5
Species Composition?	Offered area is primarily rangeland with 75% native species	35
	Offered area is primarily rangeland with 25-74% native species	20
	Offered area is compromised of 4 or more species on pasture/ hayland or is rangeland with less than 24% native species	10
	None of the above	5
Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland in the parcel to be protected?	50% or less	0
	51-60%	4
	61-70%	8
	71-80%	12
	Greater than 80%	15
Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address farm viability for future generations?	No Plan	0
	Existing plan	7
	Existing plan documented and performed by industry professional	15
Will the offered area contribute to geographic regions where the enrollment of particular land use may help achieve National, State, and regional agricultural or conservation goals and objectives, or enhance existing government or private conservation projects?	YES	15
	NO	0
Is the offered area located in an area zoned for agricultural use?	YES	15
	NO	0
Does the eligible entity have past experience managing, monitoring and enforcing easements annually?	YES	15
	NO	0
Land has current Resource Management System (RMS) conservation plan that meets or exceeds all NRCS standards and specifications OR the applicant agrees to develop a RMS plan above the minimum ACEP- ALE requirements?	YES	25
	NO	0

## Detailed Assessments

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