

**FY 2017
MASSACHUSETTS NRCS ACEP-WRE RANKING WORKSHEET**

Landowner Name: _____ Date: _____
 Farm #: _____
 Tract #: _____

Address: _____
 County: _____
 Evaluators: _____

ENROLLMENT AREA INFORMATION

1. TYPE OF APPLICATION:
 Permanent Easement 30 Year Easement 30 Year Contract (Indian Tribes Only)

2. ENROLLMENT AREA: ATTACH MAP SHOWING LOCATION AND ACREAGES OF APPLICABLE CATEGORIES

Eligible Land Types (refer to Section 528.105 of ACEP-WRE manual) **Acres**

- **Farmed or Converted Wetlands** (i.e., PC, FW, FWP): _____
- **Former or Degraded Wetlands that were/are used for food or fiber production:** _____
- **Lands Substantially Altered by Flooding:** _____
- **Riparian Areas:** _____
- **Other Eligible Land Types:** _____

Describe: _____

Total Eligible Acres: _____

Adjacent Acres = land that would contribute significantly to the wetland functions and values; allowed on 1:1 ratio unless STC waiver obtained

- **Existing natural wetlands, non-agricultural history** _____
- **Upland** _____
- **Other:** (describe) _____

Total Adjacent Acres: _____

TOTAL ENROLLMENT ACRES: (total Eligible Acres + total Adjacent Acres): _____

3. **HYDRIC SOILS:** (Soil Scientist confirmation needed.)
How were hydric soils confirmed? (check one) Onsite In Office (if so, please explain)
- _____
- _____

4. **CROPLAND – NON CROPLAND ACRES:** ATTACH MAP SHOWING ACRES AND LOCATION OF CATEGORIES:

- **Total Cropland Acres proposed for enrollment:** _____
- **Total Non-Cropland Acres proposed for enrollment:** _____

5. **WETLAND HABITAT TYPES:** ATTACH MAP SHOWING EXISTING AND PLANNED HABITAT TYPES:

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
• Upland	_____	_____
• Palustrine Emergent	_____	_____
• Palustrine Forested	_____	_____
• Palustrine Open Water/Unknown Bottom	_____	_____
• Other – Riparian	_____	_____
• Other: (describe _____)	_____	_____

ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS	POSSIBLE POINTS	POINTS RECEIVED
HYROLOGY RESTORATION		
Percent of the eligible acres that will have restored hydrology after restoration is complete On sites where original hydrology is already restored and only vegetation restoration is required, assign the maximum points.		
• ≥ 75% of eligible acres will have restored hydrology	20	
• ≥ 25 - <75% of eligible acres will have restored hydrology	10	
• Less than 25% of eligible acres will have restored hydrology	0	
Extent of original hydrology likely to be restored on the eligible acres - Take into account the manipulations that have occurred (ex., ditching, filling, berms, etc.) and the main hydrology source (ex., ground water, surface flooding, etc.). On sites where original hydrology is already restored and only vegetation restoration is required, assign the maximum points.		
• High: all hydrologic alterations will be removed or, if all hydrologic alterations can't be fully removed, the proposed restoration will include practices that can replicate the original hydrology	20	
• Medium: restoration of original hydrology is somewhat compromised because all hydrologic manipulations cannot be restored to original levels	10	
• Low: Restoration of original hydrology is severely limited (example: fill on ground water driven wetland cannot be removed)	0	
100 foot wide buffer area around proposed enrollment area has high ecological integrity (e.g., the buffer is free from human stressors such as roads, buildings, heavy invasions of invasive species, etc.).		
• Yes, buffer around proposed enrollment area has high ecological integrity	20	
• No, buffer area includes some stressors (e.g., access roads, invasive plants, etc.)	10	
• No, buffer area has buildings, roads, heavy infestations of invasive plants, etc.	0	
Proposed enrollment area is hydrologically independent (absence of upstream and downstream flow manipulations) Water diversions, impoundments, culverts, etc., upstream or downstream limit the ability to restore natural flow regime.		
• Yes, proposed enrollment area is hydrologically independent	20	
• No – hydrologic manipulations in vicinity of proposed enrollment area	10	
• No- hydrologic manipulations directly upstream or downstream of proposed enrollment area	0	
WILDLIFE HABITAT		
Proposed enrollment area is located within NHESP Priority Habitat, WLFW focus area, or Salt Marsh sparrow habitat and restoration will benefit identified species (Document on pg. 4)		
• Yes, Federally listed or candidate species, WLFW species, or Salt Marsh sparrow	20	
• Yes, State listed species	10	
• No	0	
Proposed enrollment area is located within or directly adjacent to a <i>BioMap2</i> Critical Natural Landscape data layer <i>The BioMap2</i> Critical Natural Landscape was created to identify and prioritize intact landscapes in Massachusetts that are better able to support ecological processes and disturbance regimes, and a wide array of species and habitats over long time frames.		
• Yes	10	
• No	0	
Proposed enrollment area will protect and/or restore a natural plant community type with a MA community state rank (SRANK) of S3, S2 or S1. Refer to the NHESP Natural Communities data layer and NHESP Priority Types of Natural Communities		
• Yes, proposed enrollment will protect/restore a S1, S2 or S3 community type	10	
• No, proposed enrollment will not protect/restore a S1, S2 or S3 community type	0	
Proposed enrollment area abuts (contiguous) permanently protected land on: Permanently protected land includes land in a conservation easement, state WMA lands, APR/FRPP/ACEP-ALE lands, DCR/MA Wildlife lands in a natural state, natural ponds, lakes, and rivers. Does not include lands that are only in tax reduction program such as MA Chapter 61.		
• ≥ 50% of perimeter	20	
• ≥20 - <50% of perimeter	10	
• < 20% of perimeter	0	
WATER QUALITY PROTECTION- Proposed enrollment area is located within an Outstanding Resource Water polygon		
• Yes	10	
• No	0	
FARMLAND PRODUCTIVITY – Proposed enrollment area does NOT include any cropland soils identified as prime and important		
• Yes	10	
• No	0	
SUBTOTAL: Environmental Benefits Points		

ECONOMICS		POSSIBLE POINTS	POINTS RECEIVED
RESTORATION COST PER ACRE (= total restoration cost/total enrollment acres)			
Example: Restoration Cost = \$11,400 _____.			
Total Enrollment/Easement Acres = 10 acres _____.			
Restoration Cost/Acre = \$ 1140 _____.			
Restoration Cost per Acre ≤ \$1000		30	
Restoration Cost per Acre > \$1000 to ≤ \$2000		23	
Restoration Cost per Acre > \$2000 to ≤ \$3000		16	
Restoration Cost per Acre > \$3000		9	
COST-ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT ANALYSIS			
<i>(NOTE: For all active bog applications use \$7,000/acre to estimate easement cost, for all other applications use \$1000/acre)</i>			
Example:			
Step 1: Determine Total Cost per Restorable Wetland Acre = $\frac{\text{total estimated easement cost} + \text{restoration cost}}{\text{eligible acres}}$			
Easement Cost:	\$70,000 (\$7,000 x 10 acres)	_____.	
Restoration Cost:	<u>\$11,400</u>	_____.	
Total Cost:	\$ 81,400	_____.	
Eligible Acres:	5 acres	_____.	
Cost per Restorable Wetland Acre: \$81,400/ 5 acres = \$16,280 _____.			
Step 2: Determine Cost-Environmental Benefit = $\frac{\text{cost per restorable wetland acre}}{\text{environmental pts}}$			
Cost per Restorable Wetland Acre:	\$16,280	_____.	
Environmental Benefits Pts (from page 2):	80	_____.	
Cost-Benefit: \$16,280/80 points = 203 _____.			
Active Cranberry Bog Applications	All other applications		
Cost-Benefit < 150	Cost-Benefit <50	30	
Cost-Benefit > 150 ≤ 300	Cost-Benefit <70	20	
Cost-Benefit > 300 ≤ 450	Cost-Benefit <90	10	
Cost-Benefit > 450	Cost-Benefit ≥ 120	0	
PARTNER FUNDING: Will a partnership contribution reduce NRCS costs? (only award points if NRCS has secured partner funding – document on page 4)			
Yes		20	
No		0	
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		POSSIBLE POINTS	POINTS RECEIVED
Award points based on lowest scoring hydrology restoration practice (Assign maximum points on sites where original hydrology is already restored and only vegetative restoration is needed)			
No maintenance will be required to maintain the restored wetland (e.g., tile removal, fill removal, dike removal, macro & micro topography grading, etc.)		30	
Minimal maintenance or management will be required to maintain the restored wetland (e.g., rock weirs, ditch plugs, earthen dike construction, other earthen structures)		20	
Moderate maintenance or management will be required to maintain the restored wetland (e.g., locked flumes, culverts, etc.)		10	
Long term management or intensive management is required to maintain the restored wetland (e.g., water level manipulation is required)		0	
The proposed easement contains one or more in-holdings that could impact restoration and/or easement boundary management? An in-holding is any portion cut out of the easement area that significantly increases the easement boundary edge. Example: a long cut out extending into the easement for an access road and area for building structures.			
Yes		-20	
No		0	
SUBTOTAL: Economics and Operation & Maintenance Points			
SUBTOTAL: Environmental Benefits Points (from page 2)			
Economics + Operation and Maintenance + Environmental Benefits Points = TOTAL POINTS			

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

SIGNATURES

Landowner

Date

Designated Conservationist

Date

Complete WRE Ranking Spreadsheet and Upload into Customer Service Toolkit