



# Ranking Pool Report

**Ranking Pool** FY26 VA EQIP Area 2 Ranking Tool

**Program** EQIP

**Pool Status** Active

**Tags**

**Template** EQIP

**Template Status** Active

**Existing Practice Included** Yes

**Last Modified By** Dana Bayless

**Last Modified** 03/06/2026

**National Pool** No

**Include States** VA (Admin)

## Land Uses and Modifiers

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

## Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Animals (Aquatic habitat)	0	5	100
Animals (Livestock production limitation)	0	10	100
Animals (Terrestrial habitat)	0	10	100
Energy (Inefficient energy use)	0	3	100
Plants (Degraded plant condition)	0	10	100
Plants (Fire management)	0	3	100
Plants (Pest pressure)	0	5	100
Soil (Concentrated erosion)	0	5	100
Soil (Soil quality limitations)	0	15	100
Soil (Wind and water erosion)	0	10	100
Water (Field pesticide loss)	0	5	100
Water (Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss)	0	16	100
Water (Source water depletion)	0	3	100

Animals (Aquatic habitat)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic Habitat (Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms)	0	95	100
Aquatic Habitat (Elevated water temperature)	0	5	100

Animals (Livestock production limitation)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Livestock Health (Feed and forage balance)	0	50	100
Livestock Health (Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution)	0	50	100

Animals (Terrestrial habitat)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial Habitat (Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates)	0	100	100

Energy (Inefficient energy use)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Energy Use (Energy efficiency of equipment and facilities)	0	50	100
Energy Use (Energy efficiency of farming/ranching practices and field operations)	0	50	100

Plants (Degraded plant condition)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant Health (Plant productivity and health)	0	50	100
Plant Health (Plant structure and composition)	0	50	100

Plants (Fire management)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Wildfire Hazard (Wildfire hazard from biomass accumulation)	0	100	100

Plants (Pest pressure)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant Health (Plant pest pressure)	0	100	100

Soil (Concentrated erosion)			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Soil Erosion (Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels)	0	20	100
Soil Erosion (Classic gully erosion)	0	40	100
Soil Erosion (Ephemeral gully erosion)	0	40	100

**Soil (Soil quality limitations)**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Soil Health (Aggregate instability)	0	20	100
Soil Health (Compaction)	0	25	100
Soil Health (Organic matter depletion)	0	35	100
Soil Health (Soil organism habitat loss or degradation)	0	20	100

**Soil (Wind and water erosion)**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Soil Erosion (Sheet and rill erosion)	0	95	100
Soil Erosion (Wind erosion)	0	5	100

**Water (Field pesticide loss)**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Water Quality (Pesticides transported to groundwater)	0	50	100
Water Quality (Pesticides transported to surface water)	0	50	100

**Water (Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss)**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Water Quality (Nutrients transported to groundwater)	0	15	100
Water Quality (Nutrients transported to surface water)	0	25	100
Water Quality (Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to groundwater)	0	15	100
Water Quality (Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to surface water)	0	25	100
Water Quality (Sediment transported to surface water)	0	20	100

**Water (Source water depletion)**

<b>Resource Concern</b>	<b>Min %</b>	<b>Default %</b>	<b>Max %</b>
Water Quantity (Groundwater depletion)	0	15	100
Water Quantity (Inefficient irrigation water use)	0	70	100
Water Quantity (Surface water depletion)	0	15	100

**Practices**

<b>Practice Name</b>	<b>Practice Code</b>	<b>Practice Narratives</b>	<b>Practice Type</b>
CNMP Design and Implementation Activity	101	00N	Activities
Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan	102	00N	Activities
Forest Management Plan	106	00N	Activities

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Grazing Management Plan	110	00N	Activities
Soil Health Management Plan	116	00N	Activities
Agricultural Energy Design	120	00N	Activities
Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition	138	00N	Activities
Transition to Organic Design	140	00N	Activities
Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design	144	00N	Activities
Pollinator Habitat Plan - Written	146	00N	CAPs
Pollinator Habitat Design	148	00N	Activities
Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity	157	00N	Activities
Feed Management Design	158	00N	Activities
Grazing Management Design	159	00N	Activities
Prescribed Burning Design	160	00N	Activities
Pest Management Conservation System Design	161	00N	Activities
Soil Health Management System Design	162	00N	Activities
Irrigation Water Management Design	163	00N	Activities
Improved Management of Drainage Water Design	164	00N	Activities
Forest Management Practice Design	165	00N	Activities
Conservation Plan	199	00N	Activities
Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation	201	00N	Activities
Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation	202	00N	Activities
Adaptive Management for Soil Health	204	00N	Activities
Feed and Forage Analysis	206	00N	Activities
Site Assessment and Soil Testing for Contaminants Activity	207	00N	Activities
PFAS Testing in Water or Soil	209	00N	Activities
Soil Health Testing	216	00N	Activities
Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management	217	00N	Activities
Carbon Sequestration and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Assessment	218	00N	Activities
Prescribed Grazing Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity	219	00N	Activities
Soil Organic Carbon Stock Monitoring	221	00N	Activities
Indigenous Stewardship Methods Evaluation	222	00N	Activities
Forest Management Assessment	223	00N	Activities
Aquifer Flow Test	224	00N	Activities
Waste Facility Site Suitability and Feasibility Assessment	226	00N	Activities
Evaluation of Existing Waste Storage Facility Components	227	00N	Activities
Agricultural Energy Assessment	228	00N	Activities
Feral Swine Damage Assessment	297	00N	Activities

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Alley Cropping	311	00N	Conservation Practices
Waste Storage Facility	313	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Brush Management	314	00N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Animal Mortality Facility	316	00N, 01N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Composting Facility	317	00N, 01N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Deep Tillage	324	00N	Conservation Practices
High Tunnel System	325	00N	Conservation Practices
Clearing and Snagging	326	00N	Conservation Practices
Conservation Cover	327	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Conservation Crop Rotation	328	00N, 03N, 04N	Conservation Practices
Residue and Tillage Management, No Till	329	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Contour Farming	330	00N	Conservation Practices
Contour Orchard and Other Perennial Crops	331	00N	Conservation Practices
Contour Buffer Strips	332	00N	Conservation Practices
Controlled Traffic Farming	334	00N	Conservation Practices
Soil Carbon Amendment	336	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Burning	338	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Cover Crop	340	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	00N	Conservation Practices
Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till	345	00N	Conservation Practices
Sediment Basin	350	00N	Conservation Practices
Well Decommissioning	351	00N	Conservation Practices
Monitoring Well	353	00N	Conservation Practices
Groundwater Testing	355	00N	Conservation Practices
Dike and Levee	356	00N	Conservation Practices
Waste Treatment Lagoon	359	00N	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Waste Facility Closure	360	00N	Conservation Practices
Diversion	362	00N, 01N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Anaerobic Digester	366	00N	Conservation Practices
Roofs and Covers	367	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Emergency Animal Mortality Management	368	00N, 01N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Combustion System Improvement	372	05N	Conservation Practices
Forest Farming	379	01N	Conservation Practices
Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation	380	00N	Conservation Practices
Silvopasture	381	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Fence	382	00N, 03N, 04N	Conservation Practices
Woody Residue Treatment	384	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Field Border	386	00N	Conservation Practices
Riparian Herbaceous Cover	390	00N, 01N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Riparian Forest Buffer	391	00N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Filter Strip	393	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Firebreak	394	00N	Conservation Practices
Stream Habitat Improvement and Management	395	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Aquatic Organism Passage	396	00N	Conservation Practices
Grade Stabilization Structure	410	00N	Conservation Practices
Grassed Waterway	412	00N	Conservation Practices
Wildlife Habitat Planting	420	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Hedgerow Planting	422	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Irrigation Pipeline	430	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Dry Hydrant	432	00N	Conservation Practices
Irrigation System, Microirrigation	441	00N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Irrigation Water Management	449	00N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Precision Land Forming and Smoothing	462	00N	Conservation Practices


Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Lined Waterway or Outlet	468	00N	Conservation Practices
Access Control	472	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Mulching	484	00N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Site Preparation	490	00N	Conservation Practices
Obstruction Removal	500	00N	Conservation Practices
Forage Harvest Management	511	00N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Pasture and Hay Planting	512	00N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Livestock Pipeline	516	00N	Conservation Practices
Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment	520	00N, 01N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner	521	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Pond Sealing or Lining - Concrete	522	00N, 01N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Sinkhole Treatment	527	00N	Conservation Practices
Grazing Management	528	00N, 02N, 03N, 04N	Conservation Practices
Pumping Plant	533	00N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Drainage Water Management	554	00N, 02N, 03N	Conservation Practices
Roof Runoff Structure	558	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Access Road	560	00N	Conservation Practices
Heavy Use Area Protection	561	00N	Conservation Practices
Spoil Disposal	572	00N	Conservation Practices
Spring Development	574	00N	Conservation Practices
Trails and Walkways	575	00N	Conservation Practices
Stream Crossing	578	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	00N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Channel Bed Stabilization	584	00N	Conservation Practices
Stripcropping	585	00N	Conservation Practices
Structure for Water Control	587	00N	Conservation Practices
Nutrient Management	590	00N, 06N, 07N, 08N	Conservation Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Amendments for Treatment of Agricultural Waste	591	00N	Conservation Practices
Pest Management Conservation System	595	00N, 05N, 06N, 07N	Conservation Practices
Subsurface Drain	606	00N	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Watering Facility	614	00N	Conservation Practices
Underground Outlet	620	00N	Conservation Practices
Waste Treatment	629	00N	Conservation Practices
Waste Separation Facility	632	00N	Conservation Practices
Waste Transfer	634	00N	Conservation Practices
Water Well	642	00N	Conservation Practices
Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities	643	00N, 01N, 02N	Conservation Practices
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management	644	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Upland Wildlife Habitat Management	645	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Seasonal Water Management for Wildlife	646	00N	Conservation Practices
Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt	647	00N	Conservation Practices
Structures for Wildlife	649	00N	Conservation Practices
Road/Trail/Landing Closure and Treatment	654	00N	Conservation Practices
Forest Trails and Landings	655	00N	Conservation Practices
Wetland Restoration	657	00N, 01N	Conservation Practices
Wetland Creation	658	00N	Conservation Practices
Wetland Enhancement	659	00N	Conservation Practices
Forest Stand Improvement	666	00N	Conservation Practices
Annual Forages for Grazing Systems	810	00N	Interim Conservation Practices
Organic Management	823	00N	Interim Conservation Practices
TA Design	911	00N	TSP Codes
TA Application	912	00N	TSP Codes
TA Check-Out	913	00N	TSP Codes

## Ranking Weights

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

## Display Group: FY26 VA EQIP Area 2 Ranking Tool (Active)

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

### Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: Applicability Questions		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is this an application being administered by a service center in Area 2?	YES	--
	NO	--

### Survey: Category Questions

Section: Categories for Area*		
Question	Answer Choices	Points

**Section: Categories for Area\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
<p>Category funding pools. Please select all the categories that apply to the assessment that you are ranking.</p>	Regenerative Agriculture Pilot Program	--
	ACT NOW	--
	Conservation Activities (CPAs, DIAs, CEMAs)	--
	Animal Waste	--
	Poultry	--
	Pastureland	--
	Forestry	--
	Cropland	--
	Urban/Small Scale Agriculture	--
	High Tunnels	--
	Organic Production	--
	Wildlife - Terrestrial and Aquatic 10 % Statewide	--
	WLFW Wildlife NBI- Northern Bobwhite Initiative Statewide	--
	WLFW - Golden Winged Warbler (GWWA) For Area 1 and Area 2.	--
	WLFW - Eastern Hellbender	--
	Socially Disadvantaged Farmer/Rancher (SDFR)	--
	Beginning Farmer/Rancher (BFR)	--
	Reserve #1	--
Reserve #2	--	
Reserve #3	--	

**Survey: Program Questions**

**Section: Program Questions**

Question	Answer Choices	Points
<p>Does the applicant meet the NRCS definition of a veteran farmer or rancher (VFR)? Veteran Farmer or Rancher. The term "Veteran Farmer or Rancher" means a producer who served in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard, including the reserve component thereof and was released from service under conditions other than dishonorable and who first obtained status as a veteran during the most recent 10-year period.*</p>	YES	20
	NO	0
<p>Did the applicant participate in the CRP Transition Incentives Program (TIP), and has the land in the EQIP application come out of CRP within the last 2 years?</p>	YES	5
	NO	0

**Section: Program Questions**

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Percentage of the land within the application in a Priority HUC?	51% or more of the land is within a High Priority HUC.	75
	51% or more of the land is within a Medium Priority HUC.	50
	51% or more of the land is within a Low Priority HUC.	25
Percentage of the land within the application that is within a SWCD listed as critical to The Commonwealth of Virginia meeting the agricultural sector nutrient reduction targets, as outlined in its Chesapeake Bay TMDL Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan. Critical SWCDs: Culpeper, Eastern Shore, Hanover-Caroline, Headwaters, Lord Fairfax, Northern Neck, Robert E. Lee, Shenandoah Valley, Thomas Jefferson , or Three Rivers.	100%	75
	Between 66% and 100%	50
	Between 33% and 66%	25
	between 0% and 33%	10
The application includes PLUs that are within a SWPA, AND, includes, on those PLUs, one or more of Virginia's designated SWPA Practices that will address, when implemented, an existing Water Quality or Water Quantity resource concern.	YES	25
	NO	0

**Survey: Resource Questions**

**Section: Regenerative Pilot Program\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is the applicant developing a whole farm plan and includes soil testing by planning CEMA 216 in the first and last year of the contract AND at least one primary Regen practice?	YES	20
	NO	0

**Section: Resource Questions for pastureland.\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Water Quality: Applications include practices to be implemented on the Operating Unit and/or Conservation Management Unit (CMU)* that address water quality degradation occurring from livestock access to a Vulnerable Water Feature. Refer to VA Tech Note Water Quality #1 for the definition of a Vulnerable Water Feature. <a href="https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/VA/VA_Technical_Note_Water_Quality_No_1_%28Risk_Assessment%29_2014.pdf">https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/VA/VA_Technical_Note_Water_Quality_No_1_%28Risk_Assessment%29_2014.pdf</a> .	The application includes conservation practices (382 and 390 or 391) that establishes a 35-foot (or greater) riparian buffer (planted or natural succession) and excludes livestock access to 100% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off of the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	10

## Section: Resource Questions for pastureland.\*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
	The application includes conservation practices (382) that excludes livestock access to 100% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	9
	The application includes conservation practices (382 and 390 or 391) that establishes a 35-foot (or greater) riparian buffer (planted or natural succession) and excludes livestock access to less than 100% but more than 50% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	8
	The application includes conservation practices (382) that exclude livestock access to less than 100% but more than 50% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	7
	The application includes conservation practices (382 and 390 or 391) that establishes a 35-foot (or greater) riparian buffer (planted or natural succession) and excludes livestock access to less than 50% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	6
	The application includes conservation practices (382) that exclude livestock access to less than 50% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	5
	The application includes conservation practices (472) that excludes livestock access to 100% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	3

**Section: Resource Questions for pastureland.\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
	The application includes conservation practices (472) that exclude livestock access to less than 100% but more than 50% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	2
	The application includes conservation practices (472) that exclude livestock access to less than 50% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the Operating Unit. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	1
	Not Applicable	0
Pasture Managemnt	The grazing operation on the land offered in the application will be managed according to a NEW (not currently under contract) Grazing Management Plan (528). And will be contracted for three years.	5
	The grazing operation on the land offered in the application will be managed according to an EXISTING (up to date) Grazing Management Plan (528); OR, a NEW 528 (not currently under contract) Grazing Management Plan (528). And will be contracted for 1 or 2 years.	3
	The grazing operation on the land offered in the application will not be managed according to a Prescribed Grazing Plan (528).	0
	Not Applicable	0

**Section: Resource Questions for animal waste\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Proximity of an identified Water Quality resource concern(s) caused by concentrated animal waste being addressed by this application to a Vulnerable Water Feature. Select One Distance Range	<= 35 feet	4
	36 - 70 feet	3
	71 - 140 feet	2
	141 - 300 feet	1
	> 300 feet	0.5
	Not Applicable	0
General slope of the land away from the identified water quality resource concern caused by concentrated animal waste towards a Vulnerable Water Feature. Only select one slope range.	16 % or greater	3
	7 - 15 %	2
	3 - 6 %	1
	0 - 2 %	0.5

**Section: Resource Questions for animal waste\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Environmental Sensitivity Index: Using Virginia DCR's Nutrient Management Standards and Criteria, Revised 7/2014, Table 1-4, is the predominate soil series at the site of the identified water quality resource concern caused by concentrated animal waste considered environmentally sensitive: High, Medium, or Low because of leaching potential, shallow soils, or poor drainage. Only select one sensitivity rating.	High	2
	Medium	1
	Low	0
The magnitude of the expected conservation benefits (Nitrogen Reduction associated with the proper collection, handling, and storage of manure) resulting from practices within the application addressing the water quality issues caused by the Animal Feeding Operation and or Animal Concentration Areas. Dairy, beef, horse, goat, and sheep manure production values are based on the NRCS Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook, Chapter 4 utilized on the Virginia NRCS Manure Nutrient Reduction Estimation Tool: Animal Feeding Operations/Animal Concentration Areas.	The magnitude of the expected conservation benefits resulting from planned practices that will address the water quality issues caused by the Animal Feeding Operation and Animal Concentration Areas is greater than or equal to: 25,000 lbs of N.	4
	The magnitude of the expected conservation benefits resulting from planned practices that will address the water quality issues caused by the Animal Feeding Operation and Animal Concentration Areas is greater than or equal to: 20,000 lbs of N, but less than 25,000 lbs of N.	3
	The magnitude of the expected conservation benefits resulting from planned practices that will address the water quality issues caused by the Animal Feeding Operation and Animal Concentration Areas is greater than or equal to: 10,000 lbs of N, but less than 20,000 lbs of N.	2.5
	The magnitude of the expected conservation benefits resulting from planned practices that will address the water quality issues caused by the Animal Feeding Operation and Animal Concentration Areas is greater than or equal to: 5000 lbs of N, but less than 10,000 lbs of N.	2
	The magnitude of the expected conservation benefits resulting from planned practices that will address the water quality issues caused by the Animal Feeding Operation and Animal Concentration Areas is greater than or equal to: 2500 lbs of N, but less than 5000 lbs of N.	1.5
	The magnitude of the expected conservation benefits resulting from planned practices that will address the water quality issues caused by the Animal Feeding Operation and Animal Concentration Areas is less than 2500 lbs of N.	1
	Not applicable	0
The practices included on the Planned Land Unit(s) (PLU) in this application will address an existing surface or ground water quality resource concern on a Karst Landscape? Karst refers to an area with limestone bedrock where sinkholes (open or closed), caves, areas of visible limestone outcroppings, sinking streams, etc. are present. Documentation for answering YES to this question must be documented in the applicant's project case file.	YES	2
	NO	0

**Section: Resource Questions for Poultry\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Practices within the application will address surface water quality resource concerns caused by inadequate/improper storage and handling of animal waste that is occurring:	< = 35 feet to a Vulnerable Water Feature	5
	36 - 70 feet to a Vulnerable Water Feature	4
	71 - 140 feet to a Vulnerable Water Feature	3
	141 - 300 feet to a Vulnerable Water Feature	2.5
	301 - 500 feet to a Vulnerable Water Feature	2
	501- 750 feet to a Vulnerable Water Feature	1
	> 750 feet to a Vulnerable Water Feature	0.5
General slope of the land away from the identified water quality resource concern caused by concentrated animal waste towards a Vulnerable Water Feature.	16% or greater	5
	7-15%	4
	3-6%	3
	0-2%	2
Practices within the application will address ground water quality resource concerns caused by inadequate/improper storage and handling of animal waste that is occurring on Environmentally Sensitive Sites, as defined by The Commonwealth of Virginia's Nutrient Management Standards and Criteria, Revised 7/2014, Table 1-4, where the predominate soil series has a environmental sensitivity rating of:	High	5
	Medium	3
	Low	1
	NA	0

**Section: Resource Questions for Cropland\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
The Majority, 51% or more, of the land within the application is within a NRCS CEAP Soil Vulnerability Index (SVI) for Surface Loss on Cultivated Cropland of: High, or Moderately High, or Moderate. Use CD layer "CCBI Surface Loss SVI Field Ranking"	YES	5
	NO	0
The application includes 590 Nutrient Management.	The application includes 590 Nutrient Management on land with a history of applications of nutrients using organic nutrient sources, e.g. litter, manure, biosolids.	5
	The application includes 590 Nutrient Management on land WITHOUT a history of applications of nutrients using organic nutrient sources, i.e. only commercial fertilizer used on the land within the application.	3
	Not applicable	0

**Section: Resource Questions for Cropland\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Soil Conditioning Index (SCI) - Improvement	66 percent or more of the land within the application has an Existing Condition SCI of negative 0.25 or less, and will be improve to: positive 0.25 or higher	5
	66 percent or more of the land within the application has an Existing Condition SCI of negative 0.25 or less, and will be improve to: positive 0.01 to 0.24	4
	66 percent or more of the land within the application has an Existing Condition SCI of negative 0.24 to 0.00, and will be improved to: positive 0.25 or higher	3
	66 percent or more of the land within the application has an Existing Condition SCI of negative 0.24 to 0.00, and will be improved to: positive 0.01 to 0.24	2
	66 percent or more of the land within the application has an Existing Condition SCI of positive 0.01 to 0.24, and will be improved to: positive 0.25 or higher	1
	66 percent or more of the land within the application will not see any improvement in SCI from the practices included in the application.	0.5

**Section: Forestry\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is the primary purpose of the application to address, "Native Hardwood, Shortleaf, Long Leaf Pine Management", "Invasive Species Treatment", or "Loblolly pine planting?"	Native Hardwood, Shortleaf, and Long Leaf Pine Management	4
	Invasive Species Treatment	2.5
	Loblolly pine planting.	1
The conversion of MARGINAL cropland, pasture or abandoned open land to hardwood, longleaf or shortleaf pine using Tree Shrub Establishment, (Code 612).	The conversion of MARGINAL (capability class of 4e or higher) cropland, pasture or abandoned open land to hardwood, longleaf or shortleaf pine using Tree Shrub Establishment, (Code 612).	4
	The conversion of cropland, pasture or abandoned open land to hardwood, longleaf or shortleaf pine using Tree Shrub Establishment, (Code 612)	2.5
	Not applicable	0
Plant Condition - Declining Plant Communities of Concern (Multiple answers allowed)	The proposed contract includes Forest Stand Improvement, (Code 666).	2
	As a result of the proposed EQIP contract, Prescribed Burning, (Code 338) will be used to manage Longleaf Pine within the first three (3) years.	1.5
	The proposed contract includes Forest Site Preparation, (Code 490) prior to planting trees.	0.5
	Not Applicable	0

**Section: Forestry\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Percentage of Invasive Plant Species, <a href="https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/natural-heritage/document/nh-invasive-plant-list-2024.pdf">https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/natural-heritage/document/nh-invasive-plant-list-2024.pdf</a> , identified on the land within the application that will be treated are:	75 Percent or more of the Invasive Plant Species identified are High Risk: poses a significant threat to native species, natural communities or the economy.	3
	50 - 74 Percent of the Invasive Plant Species identified are High Risk: poses a significant threat to native species, natural communities or the economy.	2.5
	25 - 49 Percent of the Invasive Plant Species identified are High Risk: poses a significant threat to native species, natural communities or the economy.	2
	24 percent or less of the Invasive Plant Species identified are High Risk: poses a significant threat to native species, natural communities or the economy.	1
	None of the Invasive Plant Species identified are High Risk: poses a significant threat to native species, natural communities or the economy.	0.5
	Invasive Plant Species are not identified as resource concern.	0

**Section: High Tunnels\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Will the planned High Tunnel(s) be located within a food desert? <a href="https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-access-research-atlas">https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-access-research-atlas</a> Go to the website, enter the atlas, zoom to your location, and then select the first 2 categories (green and orange). If the application is in the highlighted area, it's a food desert.	YES	5
	NO	0
At the time of the application, is the applicant currently (and will continue to do so via a High Tunnel) marketing/supplying, directly or indirectly, food (fresh fruits, vegetables, or value added products from fruits or vegetables) produced on the operation to:	Local schools, as part of an established Farm to School Program?	10
	Local food systems: restaurants, farmers' markets, Community Supported Agriculture (CSAs) Roadside stands, etc. ?	5
	Only growing for person use.	0

**Section: Urban/Small Scale Agriculture\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Urban/Small Scale Agriculture	This is an urban application.	15
	This is an application for a small scale agriculture.	15

**Section: Organic Production\***

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

**Section: Organic Production\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Type of Organic operation.	This is already a certified organic operation.	15
	Transitioning to become Certified Organic by the NOP	10
	Exempt from Organic Certification as defined by the NOP.	5

**Section: Wildlife - Terrestrial and Aquatic 10 % Statewide\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is this an application for Terrestrial OR Aquatic habitat?	Terrestrial	--
	Aquatic habitat	--
Virginia Wildlife Action Plan*	Does the project create or maintain habitat for Tier I, II, or III species? The benefit shall be confirmed by your Private Lands Biologist or State Biologist and documentation exists to substantiate points awarded.	8
	Does this project create or maintain habitat for Tier IV Priority Species in the watershed as documented in the Virginia Wildlife Action Plan? The benefit shall be confirmed by your Private Lands Biologist or State Biologist and documentation exists to substantiate points awarded.	4
Use the Wildlife Habitat Evaluation Tool (WHET) to determine planned habitat value and WHET score.*	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is = > 95 pointshe WHET score increased 30 points or more.	7
	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is 90-94 points	6
	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is 85-89 points	5
	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is 80-84 pointsThe WHET score DID NOT increase.	4
	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is 75-79 points	3
	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is 70-74 points	2
	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is >= 35 and <70 points	1
	The planned habitat is >=50 points and WHET score is <35 points	0
DWR Coldwater Stream Classification*	The project will occur on a wild trout stream. "Wild trout streams" are Class I-IV streams per DWR Coldwater Stream Survey (CWSS). This layer is in CD VA DWR Trout Streams	4
	The project will occur on a Stockable trout stream. Stockable trout streams designated as Class 5-6 streams per DWR Coldwater Stream Survey (CWSS). This layer is in CD VA DWR Trout Streams.	2
	Not Applicable	0

**Section: Wildlife - Terrestrial and Aquatic 10 % Statewide\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Livestock that had access to the wildlife habitat area prior to the contract will be excluded from the Project Stream Reach (if there are no livestock to exclude from the treatment area, the answer to this question is "no"). Visual evidence of the habitat degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.*	YES	2
	NO	0
The project will allow aquatic organism passage through stream.*	YES	2
	NO	0
Use the VA Aquatic Habitat Evaluation sheet and the WHET to determine scores.*	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is > 65	7
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 60 - 65	6
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 55 - 59	5
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 50 - 54	4
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 45 - 49	3.5
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 40 - 44	3
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 35 - 39	2.5
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 30 - 34	2
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 25 - 29	1.5
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 20 - 24	1
	The Planned habitat score is >=75 points and the Final WHET score is 15 - 19	0.5
Not Applicable	0	

**Section: WLFW Wildlife NBI- Northern Bobwhite Initiative Statewide\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
The PLUs included in the application intersect the NBI geodata layer,	YES	--
	NO	--
The application includes at least one of the applicable core practices or completes a conservation system that supports core practices documented as already applied on the land under contract.	YES	--
	NO	--
Practices in the application are predominantly practices which contribute to the establishment, improvement, or maintenance of NBI actions on the PLUs as described in Northern Bobwhite Grasslands, & Savannas Framework.	YES	--
	NO	--

**Section: WLFW Wildlife NBI- Northern Bobwhite Initiative Statewide\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Habitat priority - Only choose one answer	Any PLU intersects a priority area identified by your state for bobwhite or private lands specifically managed for Northern Bobwhite (NOBO).	5
	Any PLU is within 5 miles of protected lands (state or federal conservation lands, conservation easement, military installation).	3
	Any PLU is planned to support terrestrial wildlife habitat development.	1
Does the PLU directly benefit NOBO or other declining grasslands wildlife or pollinators?	PLU is within a 3 miles of any documented terrestrial state or federal T&E, or candidate for listing and/or declining bird species (e.g. Bachman's sparrow, prairie warbler, bobolink, eastern or western meadowlark, any shrike species, grassland sparrow, common ground dove, upland sandpiper).	5
	PLU is within 5 miles of occupied NOBO site or regularly managed suitable habitat.	3
	PLU is or will be > 90% native grasslands, forbs, or savannas and/or will include milkweed establishment or management.	1
Do the planned practices include actions prioritized to restore native habitat? Only choose one answer.	A prescribed burn during the growing season is planned on the PLU.	5
	A prescribed burn in any season is on the PLU and/or pollinator forage plant materials plantings are planned.	4
	At least one of the following priority conservation practices is planned on the PLU: timber stand improvement or brush management.	3
	At least one of the following practices is planned on the PLU: forage and biomass planting using only native seed mixes or range planting using only native seed mixes.	2
	At least one practice is planned that provides woody vegetative cover for wildlife use: wildlife habitat planting, hedgerow planting, windbreak/shelterbelt establishment, tree/shrub establishment, or field borders.	1
	At least one of the following practices is planned on the PLU: invasive species control or conservation cover.	0.5

**Section: WLFW - Golden Winged Warbler (GWWA)\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Does the PLU intersect the national WLFW GWWA project boundary layer filename WLFW_Golden-Winged_Warbler_ProjectBndy_FY21 in the CART geoportal?	YES	--
	NO	--

**Section: WLFW - Golden Winged Warbler (GWWA)\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
What percentage of the forest canopy in the PLU is dominated by high quality desirable GWWA species such as oak?	>75% dominated by oak and other species favored by GWWA	3
	30-74% dominated by oak and other species favored by GWWA	2
	<29% dominated by oak and other species favored by GWWA	1
	No oak and other species favored by GWWA	0
What is the average elevation of the project site?	>2000'	2
	1999' - 1000'	1
	<999'	0.25
Does the PLU intersect the priority area for conservation (PAC) WLFW Golden Winged Warbler Priority Area FY23?	PLU intersects a PAC	2
	PLU is within 4 miles of a PAC	1.5
	PLU is within 9 miles of a PAC	1
	PLU is within 15 miles of a PAC	0.5
	Any other answer	0.25
Has a site survey/database documented GWWA on or near the PLU in the past 3 years?	GWWA occurrence documented on the PLU within 3 years	2
	GWWA occurrence documented within 1 mile of the PLU	1
	GWWA occurrence documented within 2 miles of the PLU	0.5
	Any other answer	0.25
Threat 1 - Loss of young forests habitat within Eastern Deciduous Forests: Only choose one answer	Within 1.5 miles of the PLU the landcover is >75 forested and >90% deciduous.	2
	Within 4 miles of the PLU the landcover is >75 forested and >90% deciduous.	1
	Within 9 miles of the PLU the landcover is >75 forested and >90% deciduous.	0.5
	Within 15 miles of the PLU the landcover is >75 forested and >90% deciduous.	0.25
	Any other answer	0.1
Lack of management in ACTIVE, SEASONALLY OCCUPIED breeding habitat:	Habitat conditions on the PLU are degrading below GWWA nesting state (i.e. closed canopy sapling or shrub layer present and thus minimal or lack of herbaceous ground cover intermixed among shrub/sapling cover).	2
	Habitat conditions within 1.5 miles of the PLU are degrading below GWWA nesting state (i.e. closed canopy sapling or shrub layer present and thus minimal or lack of herbaceous ground cover intermixed among shrub/sapling cover).	1
	Does not apply	0

**Section: WLFW - Golden Winged Warbler (GWWA)\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Does the larger landscape surrounding the PLU contain: other young forest habitat, old field, natural shrub wetlands, or a regeneration timber harvest?	Yes within 4 miles	2
	Yes within 9 miles	1
	Yes within 15 miles	0.5
	No.	0

**Section: WLFW - Eastern Hellbender\***

Question	Answer Choices	Points
FY25 VA EQIP Application is within the Eastern Hellbender Project Boundary	YES	--
	NO	--
Water Quality: Applications include practices to be implemented that address water quality degradation occurring from livestock access to a Vulnerable Water Feature.	The application includes ALL of the following conservation practices: 382, 390 or 391, and 395 and establishes a 35-foot (or greater) riparian buffer (planted or natural succession) and excludes livestock access to 100% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the land within the application. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	15
	The application includes ALL of the following conservation practices: 382, 390 or 391, and establishes a 35-foot (or greater) riparian buffer (planted or natural succession) and excludes livestock access to 100% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the land within the application. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	10
	The application includes All of the following conservation practices: 382 and will exclude livestock access to 100% of the Vulnerable Water Features that flow off the land within the application. Visual evidence of the water quality degradation must be witnessed and documented at the time of the Inventory and Evaluation.	5
	Not Applicable	0

**Detailed Assessments**

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