

**Fiscal Year 2017
ACEP-ALE
Michigan Ranking
Form**

Landowner Name: _____

Address: _____ **State:** _____ **Zip:** _____ **County:** _____

Date: _____ **Easement Acres:** _____ **Total Points:** _____

Completed by: _____

Staff from entities submitting applications for ACEP-ALE funding consideration will determine an overall score for the parcel based on the following ranking criteria. After the parcels have been ranked, the ACEP-ALE Coordinator will review the ranking for each parcel. Parcels will be placed in ranked order and the State Conservationist will make funding selections by highest ranking.

Eligibility Criteria. Check one.

1. Has prime, unique, or other productive soil (attach soils map and documentation)
2. Contains historical or archaeological resources (attach historical documentation)
3. The enrollment of which would protect grazing uses and related conservation values by restoring and conserving land
4. The protection of which will further a State or local policy consistent with the purposes of ACEP. (attach policy)

National Ranking Factors

| | |
|---|--------------|
| <p>1) Agricultural Capacity. Priority is placed on productive farmland that has unique growing characteristics as demonstrated by the presence of Prime, Unique or Statewide Importance soils (Please round to whole numbers). Formula: $\frac{\text{Total Acre of Prime, Unique or Statewide Important Soils}}{\text{Total Parcel Acres}} \times 60$ (Score must be greater than 30 points for Eligibility Criteria 1)</p> | |
| (Max 60 points) | Points _____ |
| <p>2) Ratio of cropland, pastureland and grassland of the parcels(s) to be protected to non-agricultural land.</p> | |
| (Max 15 points) | Points _____ |
| 100% - 85% | 15 pts |
| 84% - 70% | 10pts |
| 69% - 50% | 5 pts |
| 49% - 33% | 0 pts |

| | |
|---|--------|
| <p>3) Ratio of total acres of land in the parcel to average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture. Formula: Ratio = (Parcel Size/Average Farm Size per County) (www.agcensus.usda.gov). (See Appendix A) (Max 15 points) Points _____</p> | |
| Ratio greater than 2 | 15 pts |
| Ratio of 2 – 1.1 | 10 pts |
| Ratio of 1 or lower | 0 pts |
| <p>4) Percent decrease of farm and ranch land acreage in the county that the parcel is located using the last two USDA Census of Agriculture. (See Appendix A) (Max 10 points) Points _____</p> | |
| Decrease more than 15% | 0 pts |
| Decrease from 15% - 10.1% | 5 pts |
| Decrease from 10% - 5.1% | 10 pts |
| Decrease from 5% - 0.1% | 5 pts |
| Decrease of 0% | 0 pts |
| <p>5) Percent population growth in the county that the parcel is located in as documented by the U.S. Census (www.census.gov). (See Appendix B) (Max 10 points) Points _____</p> | |
| Growth rate less than 1.0% | 0 pts |
| Growth rate of 1.0% - 3.0% | 10 pts |
| Growth rate of 3.1% - 5.0% | 5 pts |
| Growth rate more than 5.0% | 0 pts |
| <p>6) Population density (per square mile) of the county that the parcel is located in as documented by the most recent U.S. Census. (See Appendix B) (Max 10 points) Points _____</p> | |
| Density less 175 | 0 pts |
| Density of 175 - 350 | 10 pts |
| Density of 351 - 525 | 5 pts |
| Density more than 525 | 0 pts |
| <p>7) 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. (See Appendix A). (Max 10 points) Points _____</p> | |
| Less than 0.0% | 10 pts |
| Greater than 0.0% | 0 pts |
| <p>8) Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address farm viability for future generations. (Max 10 points) Points _____</p> | |
| Yes | 10 pts |
| No | 0 pts |
| <p>9) Proximity of parcel to other permanently protected land, including military installations. (Max 20 points) Points _____</p> | |
| Parcel is adjacent to protected land. | 20 pts |
| Parcel is not adjacent to but within ½ mile of protected land. | 15 pts |
| Parcel is not adjacent to but is more than ½ mile to within 2 miles of protected land. | 10 pts |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| 10) Proximity of parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure. (Max 20 points) | | Points _____ |
| Parcel is adjacent to other agricultural operations. | | 20 pts |
| Parcel is not adjacent to but within ½ mile of other agricultural operations. | | 15 pts |
| Parcel is not adjacent to but is more than ½ mile to within 2 miles of other agricultural operations. | | 10 pts |
| 11) Contiguous Acres devoted to agricultural use (cropland, pasture, hayland). (Max 20 points) | | Points _____ |
| Larger than 150 acres | | 20 pts |
| between 150 – 100 acres | | 15 pts |
| between 100 – 50 acres | | 10 pts |
| between 50 – 30 acres | | 5 pts |
| less than 30 acres | | 0 pts |
| 12) Is the parcel currently enrolled in a CRP contract set to expire within a year and is grassland that would benefit from protection? (Max 10 points) | | Points _____ |
| Yes | | 10 pts |
| No | | 0 pts |
| 13) Will the grassland in the parcel benefit from the protection under a long term easement? (Max 10 points) | | Points _____ |
| Yes | | 10 pts |
| No | | 0 pts |

Total National Points (220 max) _____

State Ranking Factors

| | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| 1) Zoning Is the location of the parcel in an area Zoned for Agricultural Use? (Max 25 points) | | Points _____ |
| The parcel is designated for agricultural use. | | 25 pts |
| The parcel is not designated for agricultural use. | | 0 pts |
| 2) Proximity of the subject parcel to existing or proposed (to be served within 5 years) public sanitary sewer and/or water lines. Provide documentation, including a map, from township or county plans describing the location of utilities in relation to the nominated property. (Max 15 points) | | Points _____ |
| Existing or proposed sewer and/or water are within ½ mile. | | 5 pts |
| Existing or proposed sewer and/or water are more than ½ mile but less than 2 miles. | | 10 pts |
| Existing or proposed sewer and/or water are 2 miles but less than 5 miles. | | 15 pts |
| Existing or proposed sewer and/or water are more than 5 miles away. | | 0 pts. |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| 3) Road frontage (paved or gravel) adjacent to parcel. (Max 25 points) | | Points _____ |
| No road frontage. | | 0 pts |
| Road frontage less than ¼ of a mile. | | 5 pts |
| Road frontage is ¼ mile or more but less than ½ mile. | | 15 pts |
| Road frontage is ½ mile or more but less ¾ of a mile. | | 20 pts |
| Road frontage is ¾ mile or more. | | 25 pts |
| 4) Is any portion of the subject parcel enrolled in the Commercial Forest Act (part 512 of NREPA), Hunter Access Program, or will the conservation easement deed provide for the non-motorized recreational use by members of the public? (Max 10 points) | | Points _____ |
| Yes | | 10 pts |
| No | | 0 pts |
| 5) Percent Matching Funds. This is determined by the following Formula: (Entity's Funds + Landowner Donation)/Appraised Fair Market Value (Max 35 points) | | Points _____ |
| 90% - 71% | | 35 pts |
| 70% - 61% | | 25 pts |
| 60% - 51% | | 10 pts |
| 50% | | 5 pts |
| 6) Is the farm MAEAP Verified? (Michigan Agriculture Environmental Assurance Program – www.maeap.org) (Max 15 points) | | Points _____ |
| Yes | | 15 pts |
| No | | 0 pts |
| 7) Multifunctional Conservation Values, Social and Economic (Max 15 points) | | Points _____ |
| Limited Resource Farmer or Rancher | | 5 pts |
| Veteran Farmer or Rancher | | 5 pts |
| Socially Disadvantaged Farmer or Rancher | | 5 pts |
| 8) Multifunctional Conservation Values, Enhancing Carbon Sequestration and Improving Climate Change Resiliency on agricultural land. (Max 10 points) | | Points _____ |
| Does the agricultural operation utilize no-till, permanent hay, pasture, or orchard? | | 10 pts |
| No | | 0 pts |
| 9) Multifunctional Conservation Values, Historical and Archaeological (Max 10 points) | | Points _____ |
| Does the parcel have any know historical or archaeological significant sites located on the property? | | 10 pts |
| Has the parcel ever had an historical or archaeological investigation by an archaeologist? | | 5 pts |
| None | | 0 pts |

| | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| 10) Does the parcel have habitat for a Federal or State listed or Candidate for listing Species? (Max 10 points) | | Points _____ |
| Yes | | 10 pts |
| No | | 0 pts |
| 11) Is the parcel currently enrolled in the Farmland and Open Space Program (P.A. 116) or similar local program? (Max 10 points) | | Points _____ |
| Yes | | 10 pts |
| No | | 0 pts |

Total State Points (180 max) _____

Grand Total _____ (Copy to front page)

Entity Signature

Date

Appendix A. Average Farm Size, Percent Decrease in Farm Land & Percent Decrease in Permanent Grass land. (USDA Census of Agriculture 2007 and 2012)

| County | Average Farm Size (Acres) | Decrease in Farm Land (%) | Decrease in Permanent Grassland (%) |
|------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alcona | 163 | -16% | 2.32% |
| Alger | 191 | -3% | 3.45% |
| Allegan | 194 | -2% | -0.25% |
| Alpena | 151 | -19% | 3.12% |
| Antrim | 155 | -5% | 0.30% |
| Arenac | 194 | -14% | 0.19% |
| Baraga | 311 | -5% | -6.69% |
| Barry | 160 | -2% | -0.60% |
| Bay | 253 | 0% | -0.20% |
| Benzie | 114 | -2% | -0.23% |
| Berrien | 147 | -7% | 0.26% |
| Branch | 232 | -2% | 0.13% |
| Calhoun | 220 | -1% | -0.36% |
| Cass | 236 | -1% | 0.24% |
| Charlevoix | 126 | -9% | -0.04% |
| Cheboygan | 146 | -4% | 4.04% |
| Chippewa | 227 | -6% | 3.82% |
| Clare | 136 | -9% | 1.33% |
| Clinton | 216 | -10% | 0.60% |
| Crawford | 56 | 0% | 6.67% |
| Delta | 250 | -9% | 4.10% |
| Dickinson | 177 | 0% | -1.83% |
| Eaton | 192 | 0% | 0.40% |
| Emmet | 139 | 0% | 5.11% |

| County | Average Farm Size (Acres) | Decrease in Farm Land (%) | Decrease in Permanent Grassland (%) |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Genesee | 148 | -5% | -0.44% |
| Gladwin | 126 | -1% | 1.79% |
| Gogebic | 98 | 0% | 0.53% |
| Grand Traverse | 108 | -13% | 2.30% |
| Gratiot | 330 | 0% | 0.36% |
| Hillsdale | 171 | -3% | 0.55% |
| Houghton | 154 | 0% | 2.29% |
| Huron | 375 | 0% | 0.01% |
| Ingham | 212 | 0% | 0.04% |
| Ionia | 224 | 0% | -0.22% |
| Iosco | 134 | -20% | 3.60% |
| Iron | 196 | -17% | -3.72% |
| Isabella | 203 | -4% | 0.14% |
| Jackson | 171 | 0% | -0.31% |
| Kalamazoo | 196 | -1% | 0.31% |
| Kalkaska | 115 | 0% | 0.01% |
| Kent | 136 | -7% | 1.67% |
| Keweenaw | 53 | -80% | 25.18% |
| Lake | 130 | 0% | 0.43% |
| Lapeer | 155 | 0% | -1.12% |
| Leelanau | 120 | 0% | 2.19% |
| Lenawee | 213 | -1% | 0.63% |
| Livingston | 117 | -11% | 0.86% |
| Luce | 270 | 0% | 6.02% |
| Mackinac | 218 | 0% | 0.87% |
| Macomb | 135 | 0% | 0.76% |
| Manistee | 137 | -4% | -2.73% |
| Marquette | 183 | 0% | 8.20% |
| Mason | 180 | 0% | 0.61% |
| Mecosta | 158 | 0% | 1.33% |
| Menominee | 231 | -11% | 3.12% |
| Midland | 161 | -1% | -0.72% |
| Missaukee | 230 | 0% | 3.32% |
| Monroe | 188 | 0% | -0.11% |
| Montcalm | 211 | -2% | 1.00% |
| Montmorency | 161 | 0% | -0.58% |
| Muskegon | 144 | -7% | 0.69% |
| Newaygo | 136 | -6% | 1.97% |
| Oakland | 59 | -2% | -0.56% |
| Oceana | 210 | 0% | -0.12% |
| Ogemaw | 243 | 0% | -0.03% |
| Ontonagon | 267 | -6% | -2.91% |

| County | Average Farm Size (Acres) | Decrease in Farm Land (%) | Decrease in Permanent Grassland (%) |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Osceola | 147 | -9% | 1.45% |
| Oscoda | 116 | -5% | 3.63% |
| Otsego | 179 | -4% | 0.92% |
| Ottawa | 137 | 0% | 0.59% |
| Presque Isle | 252 | 0% | 0.36% |
| Roscommon | 128 | 0% | 6.75% |
| Saginaw | 235 | -5% | 0.10% |
| St. Clair | 311 | 0% | 0.40% |
| St. Joseph | 299 | -27% | 0.85% |
| Sanilac | 216 | -1% | 0.16% |
| Schoolcraft | 172 | 0% | -0.40% |
| Shiawassee | 229 | 0% | -0.51% |
| Tuscola | 246 | -5% | 0.16% |
| Van Buren | 157 | -6% | 0.48% |
| Washtenaw | 138 | 0% | 0.67% |
| Wayne | 55 | -10% | 0.70% |
| Wexford | 113 | 0% | 3.73% |

Appendix B. Population Growth Rate & Population Density (US Census, 2010)

| County | Population Growth Rate | Population Density |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Alcona | -4.50% | 16.2 |
| Alger | -1.50% | 10.5 |
| Allegan | 2.10% | 135 |
| Alpena | -2.10% | 51.8 |
| Antrim | -1.30% | 49.6 |
| Arenac | -3.60% | 43.8 |
| Baraga | -2.40% | 9.9 |
| Barry | 0.20% | 107 |
| Bay | -1.50% | 243.7 |
| Benzie | 0.00% | 54.8 |
| Berrien | -1.00% | 276.2 |
| Branch | -3.90% | 89.4 |
| Calhoun | -0.90% | 192.8 |
| Cass | -1.30% | 106.7 |
| Charlev | 0.70% | 62.3 |
| Cheboyg | -1.90% | 36.6 |
| Chippew | -0.50% | 24.7 |
| Clare | -0.90% | 54.8 |
| Clinton | 2.50% | 133.1 |

| County | Population Growth Rate | Population Density |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Crawfor | -2.40% | 25.3 |
| Delta | -1.40% | 31.7 |
| Dickinson | -0.80% | 34.4 |
| Eaton | 0.80% | 187.4 |
| Emmet | 1.50% | 69.9 |
| Genesee | -3.10% | 668.5 |
| Gladwin | -1.10% | 51.2 |
| Gogebic | -4.40% | 14.9 |
| Grand | 4.20% | 187.3 |
| Gratiot | -1.90% | 74.7 |
| Hillsdale | -1.90% | 78.1 |
| Houghto | -0.40% | 36.3 |
| Huron | -3.30% | 39.6 |
| Ingham | 1.30% | 505.1 |
| Ionia | 0.60% | 111.9 |
| Iosco | -1.80% | 47.1 |
| Iron | -3.80% | 10.1 |
| Isabella | 0.40% | 122.8 |
| Jackson | -0.30% | 228.4 |

| County | Population Growth Rate | Population Density |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Kalamaz | 3.30% | 445.7 |
| Kalkask | 1.40% | 30.6 |
| Kent | 4.20% | 711.5 |
| Keween | 2.80% | 4 |
| Lake | -1.70% | 20.3 |
| Lapeer | -0.20% | 137.4 |
| Leelana | 0.90% | 62.5 |
| Lenawee | -0.90% | 133.3 |
| Livingst | 2.50% | 320.2 |
| Luce | -3.20% | 7.4 |
| Mackina | -0.60% | 10.9 |
| Macomb | 2.20% | 1,754.90 |
| Maniste | -1.30% | 45.6 |
| Marquet | 0.90% | 37.1 |
| Mason | 0.40% | 58 |
| Mecosta | 0.90% | 77.1 |
| Menomi | -1.30% | 23 |
| Midland | -0.20% | 162 |
| Missauk | 1.30% | 26.3 |
| Monroe | -1.50% | 276.7 |
| Montcal | -0.70% | 89.8 |
| Montmo | -5.00% | 17.9 |

| County | Population Growth Rate | Population Density |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Muskeg | 0.10% | 344.9 |
| Newayg | -1.20% | 59.6 |
| Oakland | 2.90% | 1,385.70 |
| Oceana | -1.30% | 51.9 |
| Ogemaw | -3.10% | 38.5 |
| Ontonag | -9.90% | 5.2 |
| Osceola | -1.50% | 41.5 |
| Oscoda | -3.20% | 15.3 |
| Otsego | 0.00% | 46.9 |
| Ottawa | 4.50% | 468.2 |
| Presque | -2.90% | 20.3 |
| Roscom | -2.10% | 47.1 |
| Saginaw | -2.60% | 250.2 |
| St. Clair | -1.90% | 226.1 |
| St. | -0.60% | 122.4 |
| Sanilac | -3.70% | 44.8 |
| Schoolcr | -3.80% | 7.2 |
| Shiawas | -2.50% | 133.1 |
| Tuscola | -3.20% | 69.4 |
| Van | -1.40% | 125.5 |
| Washten | 3.40% | 488.4 |
| Wayne | -3.20% | 2,974.40 |
| Wexford | 0.50% | 57.9 |

The USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.