Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool	Utah FY 25 ACEP-ALE-GSS				
Program	ACEP	**Pool Status**	Draft	**Tags**	
Template	ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)	**Template Status**	Active	**Existing Practice Included**	No
Last Modified By	Keila Ortiz Ortiz	**Last Modified**	10/03/2024	**National Pool**	No
				Include States	UT (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

Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	40
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 %

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 and water erosion			
Resource Concern	**Min %**	**Default %**	**Max %**
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: Utah FY 25 ACEP-ALE-GSS (Draft)

An asterisk will be displayed to show that it is a conditional section or conditional question.

Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: Is the parcel application located in Utah?		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Is the parcel application located in Utah?	Yes	--
	Otherwise	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Does the land offered for enrollment qualify for at least one land eligibility category?		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Does the land offered for enrollment qualify for at least one land eligibility category?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: National Ranking Criteria		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Percent of prime, unique, and important farmland soils in the parcel to be protected.	Property has >80%	35
	Property has >70 to 80%	30
	Property has >60 to 70%	25
	Property has >50 to 60%	20
	Property has 50% or less	0
Secured landowner water rights for lands that are prime if irrigated.	Yes	20
	No	0
	NA	0
Percent of cropland, rangeland, grassland, historic grassland, pastureland, or nonindustrial private forest land in parcel to be protected.	Property has >50%	20
	Property has >40 to < 50%	13
	Property has >33 to < 40%	7
	Property has 33% or less	0
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.	Ratio > 2.0	20
	Ratio > 1.0 to <2.0	12
	Ratio of 1.0 or less	0
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)	Decreases >15%.	20
	Decease of >10 and <15%.	14
	Decrease of >5 and <10%.	9
	Decrease of >0 and <5%.	1
	Decrease of 0% or less	0
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.(USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Decreases >15%.	20
	Decrease of >10 and <15%.	14
	Decrease of >5 and <10%.	9
	Decrease of >0 and <5%.	1
	Decrease of 0% or less.	0

Section: National Ranking Criteria

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Percent population growth in the county as documented by the U.S. Census. (Census Bureau Home Page)	Growth rate of greater than one and less than or equal to two times the State growth rate.	4
	Growth rate of two and less than or equal to three times the State growth rate.	7
	Growth rate of more than three times the State growth rate.	20
	Growth rate of less than one times the State growth rate.	0
Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent U.S. Census. (Census Bureau Home Page)	Population density of greater than three times the State population density.	20
	Population density of greater than two and less than or equal to three times the State population density.	17
	Population density of greater than one and less than or equal to two times the State population density.	9
	Population density less than one times the State population density.	0
Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations.	Plan is documented and developed by an industry professional	5
	Plan is documented	3
	No	0
Proximity of the parcel to other protected land, such as compatible military installations; 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.	EOA boundary adjoins protected land boundary.	15
	EOA is within 1 mile of protected land boundary.	8
	EOA is greater than 1 mile but less than 3 miles from protected land.	5
	Easement Offer Area (EAO) boundary greater than 3 miles from the protected land boundary.	0
Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure.	EOA boundary adjoins.	15
	EOA is within 1 mile in proximity.	8
	EOA is greater than or equal to 1 mile but less than 3 miles in proximity.	5
	Easement Offer Area (EOA) boundary greater than 3 miles in proximity.	0
Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use.	Parcel links two non-continuous corridors of protected agricultural use.	20
	Parcel is a contiguous or proximal expansion of agricultural use protected area.	11
	None of the above	0
Land is currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within 1 year and is grassland that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement or is land under a CRP contract that is in transition to a covered farmer or rancher pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 3835(f)	YES	5
	NO	0
Land is grassland of special environmental significance (GSS) that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.	YES	15
	NO	0

Section: National Ranking Criteria		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that is the eligible entity cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.	Entity contributes 50% of FMV	20
	Entity contributes 25-49% of FMV	15
	Entity contributes 10-24% of FMV	10
	Entity contributes less than 9.99% of FMV	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Utah's ACEP-GSS STATE RANKING QUESTIONS		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Does the applicant meet the NRCS definition of a historically underserved participant.	YES	10
	NO	0
Does the parcel provide one or more of the sage grouse annual habitat requirement?	0 Habitat requirements met.	0
	1 Habitat requirement met	10
	2 or more habitat requirements met.	20
Percent of property that currently contains native grasslands and/or shrublands.	Less than 50%	0
	50 - 74%	7
	75% or greater	15
For Rangeland, is the proposed grassland parcel in an annual precipitation zone of:	< 8 inches	3
	8 - 12 inches	5
	13 - 16 inches	10
	> 16 inches	20
What is the proximity of the property to an active sage grouse lek?	Active leks are greater than 2 miles from the lek.	0
	There is an active lek within 2 miles of the parcel.	5
	There is an active lek within 1 mile of the parcel.	10
	The parcel contains an active lek.	20
On how many sides is the parcel adjacent to other parcels protected from development?	None	0
	Contiguous on 1 side.	5
	Contiguous on 2 side.	10
	Contiguous on 3 or more sides	20
For Rangeland, is there a source of perennial or intermittent streams, lakes or ponds within the easement area?	None	0
	Has intermittent or ephemeral rivers and streams, seasonal lakes.	5
	Has perennial rivers and streams, permanent lakes.	10
Is water usage (Water rights) tied to the land?	YES	10
	NO	0

Detailed Assessments

Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Status