

## Exhibit A – Program Ranking Criteria for NRCS Publication

**Instruction: This document, once completed or customized where prompted, may be posted to the states' program websites to satisfy the requirement to publish the state ranking criteria before the application batching or cut-off dates. Delete this instruction before posting.**

## Ranking Criteria for NRCS Programs

### Application Overview

An applicant may submit an application to participate in the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP), Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), or Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP). The NRCS state conservationist or area director, in consultation with the State Technical Committee, Tribal Conservation Advisory Councils, local workgroups, and other stakeholders, has developed the following ranking criteria to prioritize and select applications that best address the applicable program purposes and priority natural resource concerns in **Vermont**.

The state conservationist or area director will establish application batching periods and select the highest ranked applications for funding based on applicant eligibility and the NRCS ranking process. In fiscal year 2026 NRCS will use the Conservation Assessment Ranking Tool (CART) to assess and rank all eligible applications for NRCS conservation programs.

### Inventory and Assessment in CART

CART is a decision support system that provides a consistent, replicable framework for the conservation planning process based on geospatially referenced information, client-provided information, field observations, and NRCS conservation planner expertise. CART helps NRCS conservation planners assess site vulnerability and existing conditions and identify natural resource concerns.

CART assessments of existing management and conservation efforts are compared against conservation planning criteria thresholds to determine the additional level of conservation efforts needed for addressing natural resource concerns. NRCS uses the results to identify conservation planning activities for the client. CART consolidates resource data and program information to prioritize program delivery and report outcomes of NRCS investments in conservation.

In general, resource concerns fall into one of three categories used to assess and document a resource concern:

- **Client Input/Planner Observation:** A streamlined list of options is presented to the planner to document the client's activities and the planner's observation of the resource concerns.
- **Procedural/Deductive:** A large group of resource concerns fall into this category and are assessed using a resource concern-specific evaluation tool or a list of inventory-like criteria. Due to the variability in state tools, assessment questions and answers will be broad in nature to allow states to align them with state conditions.

- **Predictive:** The remaining resource concerns are assessed using a predictive interactive model. The CART system attempts to replicate the outcomes related to the assessment threshold outcomes compared to the model outputs.

After identifying resource concerns and describing existing conditions, planned conservation practices and activities can be added to the existing condition to determine the state of the proposed management system. Practices needed to support primary conservation practices and activities are also added but do not increase conservation management points.

If the client is interested in financial assistance through an NRCS conservation program, the inventory and assessment information, along with client decisions related to conservation practice adoption, are transferred from the assessment portion to the ranking portion of CART. CART identifies the appropriate program ranking pools based on the transferred assessment information and the conservation practices proposed for implementation.

### **Ranking in CART**

In general, the ranking criteria uses the following guiding principles:

- Degree of cost-effectiveness of the proposed conservation practices and activities;
- The level of performance of proposed conservation practices and activities;
- Treatment of resource concerns or national priority resource concerns;
- Magnitude of the environmental benefits resulting from the treatment of resource concerns reflecting the level of performance of the proposed conservation practices and activities; and
- Compliance with federal, state, local, or tribal regulatory requirements for natural resources.

CART uses national ranking templates developed for each NRCS program and initiative. The templates have four parameters that are customized for each program. The four parameters are:

1. **Land Uses.** NRCS has developed land use designations to be used by planners and modelers at the field and landscape level. Land use modifiers more accurately define the land's actual use and how it is managed. Land use designations and modifiers are defined in Title 180 National Planning Procedures Handbook, Part 600.
2. **Resource Concerns.** The resource condition that does not meet minimum acceptable condition levels of the resource planning criteria. This implies an expected degradation of the soil, water, air, plant, or animal resource base that will impair the sustainability or intended use of the resource. Because NRCS quantifies or describes resource concerns as part of a comprehensive conservation planning process, which includes client objectives, human and energy resources are considered components of the resource base.
3. **Practices.** A specific treatment used to address resource concerns, or management techniques that are planned and implemented per applicable standards and specifications.
4. **Ranking Component Weights.** A set of five components that form the ranking score for an individual land-based assessment. The five components are:
  - a. **Vulnerability.** Site vulnerability is determined by subtracting the existing condition and existing practice scores from the thresholds. This score is weighted based on the resource concerns prioritized by that ranking pool.

- b. **Planned Practice Effects.** The planned practice effect score is based on the sum of the planned practice addressing the resource concern on a land unit. This score is weighted by ranking pool to address the resource concerns prioritized by that ranking pool.
- c. **Resource Priorities.** National and state resource priorities are established to address the most critical land and resource considerations and are based on NRCS national and state priorities identified with input from national, state, and local stakeholders.
- d. **Program Priorities.** National and state program priorities are established to maximize program effectiveness and advance program purposes and are based on NRCS national and state priorities identified with input from national, state, and local stakeholders.
- e. **Cost Efficiency.** Summation of planned practice points divided by the log of the practice efficiency factor, which is assigned for each asset-narrative.

**Note:** The points for vulnerability, planned practice effects, and cost efficiency are garnered from the assessment portion of CART.

**[Insert State]** created state-specific ranking pools within these national ranking template parameters. The state ranking pools include questions that are divided by sections: applicability, category, program questions, and resource questions. Ranking pool customization allows states to focus funding on priority resource concerns and initiatives identified at the state level with input from NRCS stakeholders. Each eligible application may be considered for funding in all applicable ranking pools.

### **NRCS Resource Concerns**

The NRCS resource concerns for conservation planning are:

<b>Soil</b>	<b>Plants</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheet and rill erosion</li> <li>• Wind erosion</li> <li>• Ephemeral gully erosion</li> <li>• Classic gully erosion</li> <li>• Bank erosion from streams, shorelines, or water conveyance channels</li> <li>• Subsidence</li> <li>• Compaction</li> <li>• Organic matter depletion</li> <li>• Concentration of salts or other chemicals</li> <li>• Soil organism habitat loss or degradation</li> <li>• Aggregate instability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plant productivity and health</li> <li>• Plant structure and composition</li> <li>• Plant pest pressure</li> <li>• Wildfire hazard from biomass accumulation</li> </ul>
<b>Air</b>	<b>Animals</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emissions of particulate matter (PM) and PM precursors</li> <li>• Emissions of greenhouse gasses (GHGs)</li> <li>• Emissions of ozone precursors</li> <li>• Objectionable odors</li> <li>• Emissions of airborne reactive nitrogen</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates</li> <li>• Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms</li> <li>• Feed and forage imbalance</li> <li>• Inadequate livestock shelter</li> <li>• Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality, and distribution</li> </ul>
	<b>Energy</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy efficiency of equipment and facilities</li> <li>• Energy efficiency of field operations</li> </ul>

## **Water**

- Ponding and flooding
- Seasonal high-water table
- Seeps
- Drifted snow
- Surface water depletion
- Groundwater depletion
- Naturally available moisture use
- Inefficient irrigation water use
- Nutrients transported to surface water
- Nutrients transported to groundwater
- Pesticides transported to surface water
- Pesticides transported to groundwater
- Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids, or compost applications transported to surface water
- Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids, or compost applications transported to groundwater
- Salts transported to surface water
- Salts transported to groundwater
- Petroleum, heavy metals, and other pollutants transported to surface water
- Petroleum, heavy metals, and other pollutants transported to groundwater
- Sediment transported to surface water
- Elevated water temperature

## **Program-Specific Information**

### **Agricultural Conservation Easement Program – Agricultural Land Easement (ACEP-ALE)**

The following national ranking criteria are included in the “Program Questions” section of ranking pools for ACEP-ALE, with the weighting of each question based on state-level priorities:

1. Percent of prime, unique, and important soils in the parcel to be protected.
2. Percent of cropland, pastureland, grassland, and rangeland in parcel to be protected.
3. 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.
4. Percentage decrease of acres of farm and ranch land in the parcel’s county since the last USDA Census of Agriculture.
5. Percent population growth in the county as documented by the U.S. Census.
6. Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent U.S. Census.
7. Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan for addressing agricultural viability for future generations.
8. Proximity of the parcel to other protected land.
9. Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure.
10. Maximizing the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use.
11. Land is enrolled in a Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) contract that will expire within 1 year and is grassland that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement or is under a CRP contract that is transitioning a covered farmer or rancher under 16 U.S.C. § 3835(f).
12. Land is grassland of special environmental significance that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.
13. Decrease in the percent of acreage of permanent grassland, rangeland, and pasture (other than cropland and woodland pasture) in the county the parcel is in between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture.
14. Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that is the eligible entity’s own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.

15. Does the applicant meet the NRCS definition of a veteran farmer or rancher (VFR)?
16. Did the applicant participate in the CRP Transition Incentives Program (TIP), and has the land in the application come out of CRP within the last 2 years?

The following state ranking criteria are included in the “Resource Questions” section of ranking pools for ACEP-ALE, with the weighting of each question based on state-level priorities:

1. The location of a parcel in an area zoned for agricultural use.
2. The eligible entity’s performance in managing and enforcing easements.
3. Multifunctional benefits of farm and ranch land protection, including:
  - a. Social, economic, historic, and archaeological benefits;
  - b. Increase in carbon sequestration;
  - c. Improvement of climate change resiliency;
  - d. At-risk species protection;
  - e. Reduction in nutrient runoff and improvement of water quality; and
  - f. Other related conservation benefits.
4. Geographic regions where enrolling particular lands may help achieve national, state, and regional agricultural or conservation goals and objectives or enhance existing government or private conservation projects.
5. Diversity of natural resources to be protected or improved.
6. Score in the land evaluation and site assessment system of 7 CFR Part 658 or equivalent measure for grassland enrollments, to serve as a measure of agricultural viability (access to markets and infrastructure).
7. Measures that will maintain or increase agricultural viability, such as succession plans, agricultural land easement plans (not including required highly erodible land (HEL) conservation plans), or entity deed terms.
8. Specific criteria for prioritizing parcels within designated ranking pools that will best achieve ACEP-ALE purposes and maximize the federal investment.