Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool Utah FY 25 ACEP-WRE

Program ACEP

Template ACEP-ALE General (Program Agreements)

Last Modified By Keila Ortiz Ortiz

Pool Status Draft

Template Status Active

Last Modified 10/03/2024

Tags

Existing Practice Included No

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-WRE (Draft)

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

Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: The proposed easement is within the boundary of NRCS Weber Team?		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
The proposed easement is within the boundary of NRCS Weber Team?	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%.	13
	Decrease of >5 and <10%.	10
	Decrease of >0 and <5%.	8
	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.	20
	EOA is within 1 mile of protected land boundary.	12
	EOA is greater than 1 mile but less than 3 miles from protected land.	6
	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-WRE STATE RANKING QUESTIONS		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
What percentage of the total restoration cost will be borne by other factors, such as from partner contributions or landowner contributions?	Greater than 50%	30
	50% or less but greater than 25%	24
	25% or less but greater than 15%	18
	15% or less but greater than 10%	12
	10% or less but greater than 0%	6
	0%	0
What is the cost of restoration per acre that will be borne by NRCS?	Less than $75.	30
	Equal to $75 to less than $100.	22
	Equal to $100 to less than $125.	14
	Equal to $125 to less than $150.	6
	Greater than or equal to $150.	0
The risk or on going expense associated with operation and maintenance of structures or other practices constructed to support restoration or enhancement is	Little to none	20
	Moderate	10
	High	0
The landowner is contributing to the cost of the easement or other interest (i.e., easement fair market value or equivalent) in the land offered for enrollment. Note: Includes any donated value.	Greater than 50	20
	50% or less but more than 25	13
	25% or less but more than 10%	6
	10% or less	0
Is the land offered for enrollment directly associated with another ACEP WRE enrollment or application or predecessor program closed easement, furthering the purposes of ACEP WRE?	YES	40
	NO	0
Based on the current use of the land, how many agriculturally related environmental risks and/or resource concerns would be mitigated through protection and restoration of the land offered for enrollment?	Five (5) or more	20
	Four (4)	15
	Three (3)	10
	Two (2	5
	One (1) or less	0
	None of the land is currently in agricultural production.	0

Section: Utah's ACEP-WRE STATE RANKING QUESTIONS		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
If left subject to agricultural production, are there isolated wetlands on the land offered for enrollment that would be lost?	YES	6
	NO	0
Is the land offered for enrollment (1) currently enrolled in a Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) contract that is set to expire within one (1) year from the date of application AND (2) is a farmed wetland AND (3) is?	likely to return to production once the land leaves CRP.	2
	not likely to be return to production once the land leave CRP.	1
	The application does not meet all parameters outlined in the question and/or one of the other answers above.	0
What is the duration of the proposed enrollment?	Permanent.	16
	30 year easement or contract with a concurrent enrollment in a permanent easement that will be held by another entity and takes affect after the expiration of the ACEP WRE.	8
	30 year easement or contract.	5
	Less than 30 years.	0
Once restored or enhanced, the habitat present on the land offered for enrollment will provide	Two (2) or more lifecycle needs to specific migratory bird species or other wetland dependent wildlife.	6
	One (1) lifecycle need to specific migratory bird species or other wetland dependent wildlife.	3
	No lifecycle needs will be addressed for migratory bird species or other wetland dependent wildlife.	0
Once restored or enhanced, the habitat present on the land offered for enrollment will provide for the needs of	More than ten (10) migratory bird or wetland dependent wildlife species.	10
	Between five (5) and ten (10) migratory bird or wetland dependent wildlife species.	5
	Between one (1) and five (5) migratory bird or wetland dependent wildlife species.	3
	Zero (0) migratory bird or wetland dependent wildlife species.	0
Once restored or enhanced, the land offered for enrollment will provided habitat for the following species AND is within the range of each species: (Answer all applicable; MAX Points = 8)	A Federally threatened, endangered, or candidate species.	3
	A State threatened, endangered, or species of concern.	3
	A migratory bird.	3
	Other wetland dependent wildlife not covered by another answer.	1
	No species identified or within range and/or no habitat will be present.	0
What percentage of the land offered for enrollment will be restored and/or maintained in native vegetative communities as identified in Utah?	80% or more	10
	50% or more and less than 80%	6
	25% or more and less than 50%	3
	Less than 25%	0

Section: Utah's ACEP-WRE STATE RANKING QUESTIONS		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
How many native wetland vegetative communities identified are present on the land offered for enrollment or will be present post restoration on a permanent basis?	Five (5) or more	10
	Three (3) or more	6
	One (1) or more	3
	Zero (0)	0
The land offered for enrollment is to other protected habitats on existing ACEP WRE/WRP/EWPP FPE easements; Federal, State, NGO, or local government owned land with similar protections; or privately owned conservation easements or other projects with similar protections (pending projects excluded).	Adjacent	10
	Within one half (1/2) mile	7
	Between one half (1/2) mile and one (1) mile	4
	Between one (1) mile and three (3) miles	2
	Greater than three (3) miles	0
Is the land offered for enrollment contiguous with other protected wetlands or upland habitats consistent with the management goals of ACEP WRE?	YES	5
	NO	0
The land offered for enrollment is to an impaired water body (as listed per the Clean Water Act Section 303d) and they are hydrologically connected.	Adjacent	8
	Within one quarter (1/4) mile	5
	Between one quarter (1/4) mile and one half (1/2) mile	3
	Between one half (1/2) mile and one (1) mile	1
	Greater than one (1) mile OR no impaired water bodies are hydrologically connected to the wetlands on the land offered for enrollment.	0
Are the wetlands on the land offered for enrollment hydrologically connected to and upstream from another waterbody?	YES	5
	NO	0
Does the land offered for enrollment offer ecosystem services sufficient to reduce the impact of floodwater flows in the landscape?	YES	--
	NO	0
Does the land offered for enrollment offer ecosystem services that increase water storage in the soil or groundwater?	YES	5
	NO	0
Will the restoration result in a significant land use change that restores carbon sequestering native plants such as trees, shrubs, sedges, and grasses?	Project will restore cropland to wetland and eligible upland habitat.	6
	Project will restore pasture or rangeland to wetland and eligible upland habitat.	3
	Project enhances existing, but degraded wetland and upland habitat.	1
	Restoration will not result in a significant land use change that restores carbon sequestering native plants.	0
Will the restoration result in a significant land use change that restores carbon sequestering native plants such as trees, shrubs, sedges, and grasses?	Project will restore cropland to wetland and eligible upland habitat.	6
	Project will restore pasture or rangeland to wetland and eligible upland habitat.	3
	Project enhances existing, but degraded wetland and upland habitat.	1
	Restoration will not result in a significant land use change that restores carbon sequestering native plants.	0

Section: Utah's ACEP-WRE STATE RANKING QUESTIONS		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Will the restoration provide benefits to urban or agricultural areas by reducing storm surge through floodwater attenuation?	YES	5
	NO	0
Percentage of the land offered for enrollment has previously been restored back into wetland or enhanced by another entity and the land is being managed to maintain the restored habitat and communities.	Greater than 50%	8
	50% or less but more than 35%	6
	35% or less but more than 20%	4
	20% or less but more than 10%	2
	10% or less	0
To what degree has the land offered for enrollment been altered from its historic hydrology?	More than 80% of the historic hydrology has been lost	8
	Between 25% and 80% of the historic hydrology has been lost and/or the historic hydrology has only been partially altered	6
	Between 10% and 25% of the historic hydrology has been lost and/or the historic hydrology has been minimally altered.	2
	Less than 10% of the historic hydrology has been altered and/or the historic hydrology has not been altered.	0
Of the land offered of enrollment that has been altered from its historic hydrology, what percentage of this land will be restored to its historic hydrology?	Greater than 50%	8
	50% or less but more than 35	6
	35% or less but more than 20%	4
	20% or less but more than 10%	2
	10% or less	0
Of the land offered of enrollment that has been altered from its historic hydrology, what percentage of this land will be restored to an acceptable alternative wetland vegetative community identified identified in the preliminary Wetlands Restoration Plan of Operations (WRPO)?	0%; all land will be restored to historic hydrology.	8
	25% or less but greater than 0%	6
	50% or less but greater than 25%	4
	75% or less but greater than 50%	2
	Greater than 75%	0
Are the soil properties (such as soil texture, soil structure, and soil drainage classes) and landscape features (geomorphic position, slope, and water table depths) appropriate for the practices and practice locations identified in the preliminary Wetlands Restoration Plan of Operations (WRPO)?	YES	4
	NO	0
Are flooding characteristics (such as frequency, timing, duration, depth and sources) conducive to the practices and practice locations identified in the preliminary Wetlands Restoration Plan of Operations (WRPO)?	YES	5
	NO	0
What is the primary water source for the land offered for enrollment?	A surface water right	8
	Surface or ground water existing on site	6
	Free flowing river	4
	Shares in a ditch company	2
	A well	1
	There is no primary water source available.	0

Section: Utah's ACEP-WRE STATE RANKING QUESTIONS		
Question	**Answer Choices**	**Points**
Are the water supplies supporting the hydrologic and ecological function of the wetlands subject to administration of water rights by the state AND does the landowner hold a decreed surface or groundwater right that would support the planned hydrologic and ecological functionality of the wetlands in perpetuity?	YES	5
	NO	0
Are the wetlands existing or planned on the land offered for enrollment hydrologically connected to other water sources?	YES	8
	NO	0
Are the wetlands existing or planned on the land offered for enrollment functional independent of water rights?	YES	8
	NO	0
Which best describes the degree of hydrologic restoration the project will accomplish?	Full restoration of natural, historic hydrologic regime and historic wetland types.	30
	Restoration closely mimics natural, historic hydrologic regime via a combination of naturally available water and supplementary water rights. Historic wetland types are restored and the use of dikes and/or water control structures is very minimal.	25
	Restoration closely mimics natural, historic hydrologic regime via a combination of naturally available water and supplementary water rights. Historic wetland types are largely restored but restoration is only possible via significant use of dikes and/or water control structures.	20
	Restoration is a moderate reflection of the natural, historic hydrologic regime via managed hydrology using dikes and/or water control structures and historic wetland types are only partially restored (note: alternative wetland types cannot exceed 30% of the easement area).	15
	Restoration is a minimal reflection of the natural, historic hydrologic regime via managed hydrology using dikes and/or water control structures and historic wetland types are only partially restored (note: alternative wetland types cannot exceed 30% of the easement area).	10
	Project consists largely of riparian restoration (note: special conditions apply for such projects to be eligible).	5
	None of the above	0

Detailed Assessments

Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Status