

USDA Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool CO FY25 ACT NOW Wildlife

Program EQIP

Pool Status Draft

Tags ACT NOW

Template EQIP General National Ranking Template - Amended October 2023

Template Status Active

Existing Practice Included No

Last Modified By Kindra Brandner

Last Modified 12/04/2024

National Pool No

Include States CO (Admin)

Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Associated Ag Land	--	x	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Crop	--	x	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Farmstead	--	x	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Forest	--	x	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Pasture	--	x	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Range	--	x	N/A	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Water	N/A	x	N/A	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic habitat	0	50	100
Terrestrial habitat	0	50	100

Aquatic habitat			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms	0	50	100
Elevated water temperature	0	50	100

Terrestrial habitat			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates	0	100	100

Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Wildlife Habitat Planting	420	00N	Conservation Practices
Structures for Wildlife	649	00N	Conservation Practices
Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design	144	00N	Activities
Pollinator Habitat Design	148	00N	Activities
Brush Management	314	00N	Conservation Practices
Conservation Cover	327	01N, 00N-CRP-R, 00N	Conservation Practices
Conservation Crop Rotation	328	00N	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Burning	338	00N	Conservation Practices
Cover Crop	340	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Dike and Levee	356	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Pond	378	00N	Conservation Practices
Fence	382	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 03N	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
Stream Habitat Improvement and Management	395	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Aquatic Organism Passage	396	00N	Conservation Practices
Grade Stabilization Structure	410	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Hedgerow Planting	422	01N, 00N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Mulching	484	03N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Site Preparation	490	00N	Conservation Practices
Obstruction Removal	500	00N	Conservation Practices
Pasture and Hay Planting	512	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Livestock Pipeline	516	00N	Conservation Practices
Pumping Plant	533	00N	Conservation Practices
Range Planting	550	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 01N	Conservation Practices
Heavy Use Area Protection	561	00N	Conservation Practices
Spring Development	574	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	00N	Conservation Practices
Open Channel	582	00N	Conservation Practices
Structure for Water Control	587	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	00N, 00N-CRP-R, 01N	Conservation Practices
Watering Facility	614	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Water Well	642	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities	643	00N-CRP-R, 00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management	644	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Upland Wildlife Habitat Management	645	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Shallow Water Development and Management	646	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt	647	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Wetland Restoration	657	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Wetland Creation	658	00N, 00N-CRP-R	Conservation Practices
Wetland Enhancement	659	00N	Conservation Practices
Forest Stand Improvement	666	00N	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Grazing	528	02N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Woody Residue Treatment	384	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices
Conservation Plan	199	00N	Activities
Irrigation Pipeline	430	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	01N, 00N	Conservation Practices

Ranking Weights

Factors	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Vulnerabilities	Default	10	20	40
Planned Practice Effects	Adjustment (D)	15	15	15
Resource Priorities	Default	20	50	60
Program Priorities	Default	5	5	15
Efficiencies	Default	10	10	10

Display Group: CO FY25 ACT NOW Wildlife (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
Is the objective of the project to benefit wildlife?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
The majority of the plu's are located in the following Area	Area 1	--
	Area 2	--
	Area 3	--
	Otherwise	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: Program Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points

Section: Program Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. The application will address	Five Priority Resource Concerns	110
	Four Priority Resource Concerns	75
	Three Priority Resource Concerns	50
	Two Priority Resource Concerns	25
	One Priority Resource Concerns	10
	No Priority Resource Concerns will be addressed	0
2. Does the application have CRP lands transitioning to EQIP that will be maintained in permanent cover?	All transitioning CRP acres will maintain a permanent cover for the term of the EQIP contract.	90
	50-99% of the transitioning CRP acres will maintain a permanent cover for the term of the EQIP contract.	75
	25-49% of the transitioning EQIP acres will maintain a permanent cover for the term of the contract.	60
	Less than 25% of the transitioning CRP acres will be maintained in permanent cover	40
	NA	0
3. Has the applicant had a contract in any NRCS program terminated for reasons within their control in the last three years; OR does the applicant have an existing contract in any NRCS program that has been determined to be in noncompliance for reasons within their control, and is currently under an active NRCS-CPA-153; OR is NRCS aware that the applicant has failed to properly operate and maintain conservation practices or activities that were installed with program financial assistance and are still within their lifespan, even if the contract is expired?	YES	-200
	NO	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: Area 1*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Does the application directly address limiting habitat factors for:	Multiple species, including a Federally threatened, endangered, or candidate species, as well as State SWAP Tier 1 and/or 2 species and/or pollinators.	60
	Federally threatened, endangered, or candidate species.	50
	State endangered, threatened, and species of concern (SWAP tier 1 Species) and/or pollinators.	40
	CO SWAP Tier 2 Species and game species of economic importance (elk, mule deer, pheasant, quail, waterfowl, native/naturalized trout)	20
	all other species	0

Section: Area 1*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
2. The application's Habitat Evaluation (WHEG/SVAP2/CPW Habitat scorecard) score improvement indicates the likely habitat benefits for target species is:	WHEG score increase of 0.4 or greater, or other method of habitat evaluation indicates the application will significantly improve or restore habitat conditions for the target species, group of species, or ecological site (terrestrial or aquatic).	60
	WHEG score increase of 0.2-0.3, or other method of habitat evaluation indicates the application will improve habitat conditions for the target species, group of species, or ecological site (terrestrial or aquatic).	40
	WHEG score increase of 0.1, or other method of habitat evaluation indicates the application will minimally improve habitat for the target species, group of species, or ecological site (terrestrial or aquatic).	20
	0 indicates no habitat improvement.	0
3. Does the application increase habitat connectivity for the target species?	Yes, the application removes significant barriers to wildlife movement within the target species core range (ex. removal of non-wildlife friendly fencing, in-stream or channel barriers) habitat/riparian buffer planting or brush management, or restoration of rare/declining natural community, etc.	60
	Yes, the application is near target species habitat (<2 miles) and improves habitat patch size and/or quality (ex. brush management, tree planting, wet meadow restoration, riparian protection, conservation cover, etc.)	40
	Yes, the application improves habitat quality through improved land/wetland management (ex. livestock grazing, weed treatment, streambank protection, wildlife habitat management, etc.)	20
	The application does minimal for habitat connectivity because it is isolated from the target species core range and outside the target species normal daily movement range.	0
4. A NRCS Biologist or Partner Biologist has reviewed and concurred to the wildlife habitat benefits of the project.	YES	20
	NO	0

Section: Area 2*

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

Section: Area 2*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Does the application directly address limiting habitat factors for:	Federally threatened, endangered, or candidate species	60
	State endangered or threatened species, or upland bird species of economic importance (pheasant, greater prairie chicken, bobwhite quail)	50
	Big game species of economic importance (Mule deer, elk, turkey), North American beaver, Tier 1 SWAP species.	10
	All other species	0
2. Level of habitat impact:	Project converts cropland or introduced pasture/hayland/monoculture grass to permanent wildlife cover.	60
	Project significantly restores the desired plant community of ecological site by removing encroaching/overstocked trees or invasive non-native shrubs (ex. Russian-olive/tamarisk removal, ponderosa pine or aspen restoration)	30
	Project enhances existing degraded riparian habitat.	20
	All other	0
3. Does the application increase habitat connectivity for the target species?	Adjacent to previously restored or protected lands	30
	Within 1 mile of previously restored or protected lands	15
	Within 5 miles of previously restored or protected lands	10
	Greater than 5 miles to previously restored or protected lands	0
	NA	0
4. A NRCS Biologist or Partner Biologist has reviewed and concurred to the wildlife habitat benefits of the project.	YES	10
	NO	0
5. Does the project address pollinator habitat by a pollinator WHEG score (after) of 0.5 or greater?	YES	40
	NO	0

Section: Area 3*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Does the application directly address limiting habitat factors for:	Federally threatened, endangered, or candidate species (ex. monarchs, prairie chicken)	60
	State endangered or threatened species, or game species of economic importance (elk, mule deer, pheasant, quail, waterfowl, trout)	40
	State Species of Concern, SWAP Tier I species, keystone species (ex. beaver) or pollinators	20
	Other	0

Section: Area 3*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
2. Level of habitat impact:	Project "converts" cropland, CRP, or introduced pasture/hayland to permanent wildlife habitat (ex. projects including facilitating practices to allow prescribed grazing on expired CRP)	60
	Project enhances existing degraded habitat (ex. wet meadow restoration, streambank restoration)	40
	Project significantly restores an ecological site by removing encroaching trees or invasive shrubs (ex. PJ, Russian olive, tamarisk)	30
	All other	0
3. Does the application increase habitat connectivity for the target species or habitat?	Project addresses habitat connectivity within the target species core range and is adjacent to previously restored or protected land (ex. removal of non-wildlife friendly fencing, in-stream or channel barriers, restoration of rare/declining natural community, etc.)	60
	Project addresses habitat connectivity within the target species core range within 1 miles of previously restored or protected land	40
	Project addresses habitat connectivity within the target species core range within 5 miles of previously restored or protected land	30
	Project addresses habitat connectivity within the target species core range but is greater than 5 miles of previously restored or protected lands	20
	NA	0
4. A NRCS Biologist or Partner Biologist has reviewed and concurred to the wildlife habitat benefits of the project.	YES	20
	NO	0

Detailed Assessments

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