



# Ranking Pool Report

**Ranking Pool** IRA Illinois

**Program** ACEP-WRE

**Template** IRA ACEP-WRE

**Last Modified By** David Hiatt

**Pool Status** Active

**Template Status** Active

**Last Modified** 10/02/2024

**Tags** IRA

**Existing Practice Included** No

**National Pool** No

**Include States** IL (Admin)

## Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Crop	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Forest	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--

## Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Air quality emissions	10	10	60
Aquatic habitat	10	20	70
Concentrated erosion	0	5	60
Degraded plant condition	0	5	60
Field pesticide loss	0	5	60
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	60
Long term protection of land	10	15	70
Pest pressure	0	5	60
Source water depletion	0	5	60
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	60
Terrestrial habitat	10	10	70
Weather resilience	0	5	20
Wind and water erosion	0	5	15

Air quality emissions			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Emissions of greenhouse gases - GHGs	100	100	100

## 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	30	75
Pesticides transported to surface water	25	70	100

## Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	28	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	35	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

## 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

## 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	90	100
Wind erosion	0	10	100

## Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Wildlife Habitat Planting	420	00N	Conservation Practices
Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement	LTPPE	00N	Easements
Structures for Wildlife	649	00N	Conservation Practices
Long-Term Protection of Land - Maximum Duration Allowed by State Law	LTPMAS	00N	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Easement	LTP30YE	00N	Easements

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Contract	LTP30YC	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Title Search	LTAPTS	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Full Phase I	LTAPFP1	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal	LTAPA	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Update	LTAPAU	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review	LTAPTR2	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Boundary Survey	LTAPBS	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Closing Services	LTAPCS	00N	Easements
Brush Management	314	03N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Clearing and Snagging	326	00N	Conservation Practices
Conservation Cover	327	01N, 00N-CRP-R, 00N	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Burning	338	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Cover Crop	340	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Dam, Diversion	348	00N	Conservation Practices
Well Decommissioning	351	00N	Conservation Practices
Dike and Levee	356	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Diversion	362	02N, 00N, 03N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation	380	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Fence	382	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Field Border	386	00N	Conservation Practices
Riparian Herbaceous Cover	390	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 01N	Conservation Practices
Riparian Forest Buffer	391	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Filter Strip	393	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 01N	Conservation Practices
Firebreak	394	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Stream Habitat Improvement and Management	395	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Aquatic Organism Passage	396	00N	Conservation Practices
Dam	402	00N	Conservation Practices
Grade Stabilization Structure	410	00N-CRP-R, 00N	Conservation Practices
Land Clearing	460	00N	Conservation Practices
Land Smoothing	466	00N	Conservation Practices
Access Control	472	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Mulching	484	02N, 00N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Site Preparation	490	00N	Conservation Practices
Obstruction Removal	500	00N	Conservation Practices
Pumping Plant	533	02N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Range Planting	550	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 01N	Conservation Practices
Drainage Water Management	554	02N, 00N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Access Road	560	00N	Conservation Practices
Trails and Walkways	575	00N	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	00N	Conservation Practices
Channel Bed Stabilization	584	00N	Conservation Practices
Structure for Water Control	587	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Nutrient Management	590	08N, 07N, 06N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Pest Management Conservation System	595	01N, 00N, 04N, 03N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Subsurface Drain	606	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Surface Roughening	609	00N	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 01N	Conservation Practices
Underground Outlet	620	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities	643	00N-CRP-R, 00N, 02N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management	644	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Upland Wildlife Habitat Management	645	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Shallow Water Development and Management	646	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt	647	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Windbreak/Shelterbelt Renovation	650	00N	Conservation Practices
Forest Trails and Landings	655	00N	Conservation Practices
Constructed Wetland	656	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Wetland Restoration	657	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 01N	Conservation Practices
Wetland Creation	658	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Wetland Enhancement	659	00N	Conservation Practices
Forest Stand Improvement	666	00N	Conservation Practices
Well Plugging	755	00N	Interim Conservation Practices
Stream Crossing	578	00N-CRP-R, 00N, 02N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Fuel Break	383	00N	Conservation Practices
Woody Residue Treatment	384	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Road/Trail/Landing Closure and Treatment	654	00N	Conservation Practices
Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress	LTAPIE	00N	Easements
Drainage Ditch Covering	775	00N	Interim Conservation Practices
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices

## Ranking Weights

Factors	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Vulnerabilities	Default	5	5	10
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	10	10
Resource Priorities	Default	40	40	40
Program Priorities	Default	45	45	45
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

## Display Group: IRA Illinois (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
Did the applicant apply for IRA ACEP-WRE enrollment?	YES	--
	NO	--

### Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
The proposed easement most closely aligns with which of the following IRA ACEP-WRE priorities?	Highly organic soils and high carbon mineral soils	--
	Restored and managed as native forest habitat	--
	Native forest habitat to be maintained as native forest habitat	--
	Agricultural cranberry bogs that is capable of being restored to native wetland habitat	--
	Drained or degraded montane wet meadows that are capable of hydrologic restoration.	--
	Ephemeral wetlands that will be restored to native grassland habitat	--

### Survey: Program Questions

Section: All Categories		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Describe the self-certification of the applicants from the NRCS-CPA-1200?	Historically Underserved (HU), including Socially Disadvantaged Farmer or Rancher (SDFR), Beginning Farmer or Rancher (BFR), Veteran Farmer or Rancher (VFR), or Limited-Resource Farmer or Rancher (LRFR)	25
	Applicant is a covered producer participating in the CRP Transition Incentives Program (CRP-TIP)	5
	Not Historically Underserved	0
	Blank	0

## Section: All Categories

Question	Answer Choices	Points
2. What percentage of the proposed easement area intersects with Priority Area 1 (red on the map)	Greater than or equal to 75%	40
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than or equal to 74%	20
	Greater than or equal to 25% and less than or equal to 49%	8
	Otherwise	0
3. What percentage of the proposed easement area intersects with Priority Area 2 (yellow on the map)	Greater than or equal to 75%	15
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than or equal to 74%	8
	Greater than or equal to 25% and less than or equal to 49%	3
	Otherwise	0
4. What percentage of the proposed easement area intersects with either Priority Area 1 and/or Priority Area 2?	Greater than or equal to 25% and less than or equal to 49%	5
	Intersects either Priority area	2
	Otherwise	0
5. What percentage of the proposed easement area is currently forested habitat that will be maintained as forested habitat?	Greater than or equal to 40%	20
	Greater than or equal to 20% and less than or equal to 39%	8
	Less than or equal to 19%	0
6. Does the proposed easement area intersect with the highly organic soils priority area 1 and/or priority area 2 by 25% or more?	Yes	10
	No	0
7. What percentage of the proposed easement area will be restored to native forest?	Greater than or equal to 40%	20
	Greater than or equal to 20% and less than or equal to 39%	8
	Less than or equal to 19%	0
8. Select the number of wetlands/potholes/playas/vernal pools to be protected and restored within the proposed easement area:	More than 5	20
	3-5	12
	2	6
	1	0
9. Does the proposed easement area intersect one of the following national priority areas: Chesapeake Bay Watershed Initiative; Mississippi River Basin Initiative (MRBI) Focus Area Watersheds; National Water Quality Initiative (NWQI) Watershed Implementation Priority Areas; Source Water Protection High Priority Areas.	YES	20
	NO	0
10. Percentage of the proposed easement area under annual row crop production or pasture that will be restored to native vegetation as a planned practice under the Wetland Reserve Plan of Operations?	Greater than 25%	5
	0-25%	0
11. Is the proposed easement area a single contiguous parcel without inholdings or recognized rights-of-way that may affect the proposed restoration and future easement stewardship?	YES	20
	NO	0

## Survey: Resource Questions



**Section: Priority Areas**

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Proximity of other lands permanently protected for the purpose of wildlife and habitat conservation in relation to the proposed easement area?	Adjacent (Touching along a shared boundary)	10
	Within 0.5 miles	7
	Within 1 mile	5
	Within 2 miles	2
	Greater than 2 miles	0
2. Habitat restoration will address elements of the recovery plan of how many State or Federally Threatened or Endangered Species?	3 or more	10
	2	5
	1	2
	0	0
3. What percentage of hydrological restoration will provide hydrologic conditions suitable for the needs of wetland dependent wildlife species that occur in the area?	Greater than or equal to 50%	10
	Greater than or equal to 20% and less than 50%	4
	Less than 20%	0
4. What percent of altered hydrology is restorable?	Greater than or equal to 75%	15
	Greater than or equal to 50 and less than 75%	10
	Greater than or equal to 25 and less than 50%	5
	Less than 25%	0
5. What percentage of the restorable land will provide flood water attenuation?	Greater than or equal to 50% of the proposed easement area is classified as "Frequent or Very Frequent: Chance of Flooding is more than 50% in any year"	15
	Greater than or equal to 50% of the proposed easement area is classified as "Occasional: Chance of Flooding is 5% to 50% in any year"	8
	Less than 50% of the proposed easement area is classified as "Frequent or Very Frequent: Chance of Flooding is more than 50% in any year"	5
	Less than 50% of the proposed easement area is classified as "Occasional: Chance of Flooding is 5% to 50% in any year"	2
	100% of the proposed easement area is classified as "Rare, Very Rare, or None: Chance of Flooding is 0% to 5% in any year"	0
6. Does all or part of the application easement PLU fall in the Hackmatack NWR Planning or Corridor Units?	Yes	20
	No	0
7. Does all or part of the application easement PLU fall in the Lower Little Wabash/Bonpas Creek watershed.	Yes	20
	No	0
8. Does all or part of the application easement PLU fall in the Pecatonica watershed.	Yes	20
	No	0

## Section: Priority Areas

Question	Answer Choices	Points
9. Does all or part of the application easement PLU fall in the Kaskaskia River watershed below Carlyle Lake to the confluence of the Mississippi River.	Yes	20
	No	0
10. How does the total estimated restoration cost for the proposed easement area compare to the fair market value of the property to be protected?	Total restoration cost is <50% of the fee-title fair market value of the proposed easement area	18
	Total restoration cost is between 51-80% of the fee-title fair market value of the proposed easement area	8
	Total restoration cost is >80% of the fee-title fair market value of proposed easement area	0

## Detailed Assessments

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