

**Agricultural Conservation Easement Program - Agricultural Land Easement (ACEP-ALE)
 Example Parcel Eligibility and Ranking Form**

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Fiscal Year | |
| Landowner Name and Address | |
| Eligible entities names and addresses | |
| Parcel Location: | Locality (Town/Township): |
| County: | State: |
| Are all landowners of record AGI eligible? (Y/N) | |
| Are all landowners of record HEL eligible? (Y/N) | |
| Are all landowners of record WC eligible? (Y/N) | |
| NRCS employee confirming landowner eligibility: | |
| Name: | Signature: |
| Is the entity eligible? (Y/N) | |
| NRCS employee confirming entity eligibility: | |
| Name: | Signature: |
| Does the eligible entity have a written pending offer for the parcel? (Y/N) | |
| NRCS employee confirming written pending offer: | |
| Name: | Signature: |
| Does the land (<i>enter a response for each</i>): | |
| _____ Have 50-percent prime, unique, and important farmland? (Y/N) | |
| _____ Have historical or archeological resources? (Y/N) | |
| _____ Protect grazing uses and related conservation values by restoring and conserving land? (Y/N) | |
| _____ Have land that supports the policy of a State or local farm and ranch land protection program? (Y/N) | |
| Is the land eligible? (Y/N) | |
| Which land eligibility criteria is the land being enrolled under? (<i>Identify only one eligibility category</i>) | |
| _____ | |
| NRCS employee confirming land eligibility: | |
| Name: | Signature: |

ACEP-ALE Ranking Criteria for NRCS California

(Revised 12/13/2017)

Fiscal Year: _____

Cooperating Entity: _____

Landowner Name: _____

County: _____

Evaluator Name: _____

Evaluation Date: _____

Parcel Acres: _____

National Ranking Criteria:

1. Percentage of prime, unique, and statewide/locally important soil or rangeland that would be protected on the parcel.

Total Parcel acres:

(only count acres once)

| | Acres | % | | Points | Score |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|--------|----------------------|
| Prime Soils | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | >90-100% | 30 | <input type="text"/> |
| Unique Soils | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | >80-90% | 25 | <input type="text"/> |
| Statewide Important Soils | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | >70-80% | 15 | <input type="text"/> |
| Locally Important Soils ¹ | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | >60-70% | 10 | <input type="text"/> |
| Rangeland/Grassland | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | >50-60% | 5 | <input type="text"/> |
| TOTAL | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0%"/> | 0-50% | 0 | <input type="text"/> |

¹ Locally important soils must be supported by County Board of Supervisors resolution as identified by the CA Dept. of Conservation's Farmland of Local Importance definition.

2. Percentage of cropland, pastureland, rangeland or grassland on the parcel. (Ag land only, do not include homestead, building envelopes, developed areas, etc)

Total Parcel acres:

| | Acres | % | | Points | Score |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|--------|----------------------|
| Cropland | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | 91-100% | 30 | <input type="text"/> |
| Pastureland | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | 81-90% | 25 | <input type="text"/> |
| Rangeland/Grassland | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0"/> | 66-80% | 15 | <input type="text"/> |
| TOTAL | <input type="text" value="0"/> | <input type="text" value="0%"/> | 51-65% | 10 | <input type="text"/> |
| | | | 34-50% | 5 | <input type="text"/> |
| | | | 0-33% | 0 | <input type="text"/> |

3. Ratio of the total parcel size to be protected versus the average farm size in the county.
 (www.agcensus.usda.gov)

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Parcel Size | 0.0 | ac. |
| Average Farm Size for County | | ac. |
| Ratio | 0 | |

| Ratio | Points | Score |
|---------|--------|-------|
| > 3 | 15 | |
| 2 - 3 | 10 | |
| 1 - 1.9 | 5 | |
| < 1 | 0 | |

4. Decrease of farm and ranch land in the county between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture.
 (www.agcensus.usda.gov)

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-----|
| Current Census (2012) | | ac. |
| Previous Census (2007) | | ac. |
| Percent Change | 0 | |

(only provide points for a negative value)

| Decrease | Points | Score |
|----------------|--------|-------|
| > 15% | 15 | |
| 11-15% | 12 | |
| 6-10% | 8 | |
| 1-5% | 4 | |
| 0% or Increase | 0 | |

5. Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland, pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county between last two USDA censuses of Agriculture.
 (www.agcensus.usda.gov)

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-----|
| Current Census (2012) | | ac. |
| Previous Census (2007) | | ac. |
| Percent Change | 0 | |

(only provide points for a negative value)

| Decrease | Points | Score |
|----------------|--------|-------|
| > 15% | 15 | |
| 11-15% | 12 | |
| 6-10% | 8 | |
| 1-5% | 4 | |
| 0% or Increase | 0 | |

6. Ratio of population growth in the county versus the statewide growth rate as documented by the most recent U.S. census. (www.census.gov)

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| County Growth Rate | |
| State Growth Rate | |
| Ratio | 0 |

| Ratio | Points | Score |
|---------|--------|-------|
| > 3 | 15 | |
| 2 - 3 | 10 | |
| 1 - 1.9 | 5 | |
| < 1 | 0 | |

7. Ratio of county population density versus statewide population density based on the most recent U.S. census.

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------|--------|-------|
| County Population Density | | Ratio | Points | Score |
| State Population Density | | > 3 | 15 | |
| Ratio | 0 | 2 - 3 | 10 | |
| | | 1 - 1.9 | 5 | |
| | | < 1 | 0 | |

8. Proximity of the parcel to other protected land within 1 mile radius.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|-------|
| | Points | Score |
| > 500 acres within 1 mile | 20 | |
| 251 - 500 acres within 1 mile | 15 | |
| 100 - 250 acres within 1 mile | 10 | |
| < 100 acres within 1 mile | 5 | |
| No protected land within 1 mile | 0 | |

9. Proximity of the parcel to other agriculture operations & infrastructure within 1 mile radius.

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------|
| | Points | Score |
| > 500 acres within 1 mile | 20 | |
| 251 - 500 acres within 1 mile | 10 | |
| 100 - 250 acres within 1 mile | 5 | |
| < 100 acres within 1 mile | 0 | |

10. Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or adjacent agricultural easements.

| | | |
|--|--------|-------|
| | Points | Score |
| Parcel links two agricultural easements | 10 | |
| Parcel is adjacent to an agricultural easement | 7.5 | |
| Parcel is non-contiguous to an agricultural easement | 0 | |

11. Evidence of farm or ranch succession plan for the landowner established to address farm viability for future generations.

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-------|
| | Points | Score |
| Written Plan by industry professional | 5 | |
| Written Plan | 3 | |
| No plan | 0 | |

12. Parcel is currently enrolled in a CRP contract that is set to expire within a year and is a grassland that would be protected by the easement.

| | Points | Score |
|-----|--------|-------|
| Yes | 5 | |
| No | 0 | |

13. Parcel is is a grassland of special environmental significance that will benefit from the protection under the long-term easement.

| | Points | Score |
|-----|--------|-------|
| Yes | 5 | |
| No | 0 | |

Total Points for National Ranking Criteria (200 max. points)

| |
|-----|
| 0.0 |
|-----|

State Ranking Criteria:

1. Parcel is located in an area zoned for agricultural use with a minimum ag zoning designation.

| Zoned | Points | Score |
|--------------|--------|-------|
| < 40 ac. | 20 | |
| 40 - 80 ac. | 15 | |
| 80 - 160 ac. | 10 | |
| > 160 ac. | 5 | |

2. Number of potential legal parcels under current zoning.

Size of Offering: ac.
 Current Zoning:
 # Potential Parcels:

| # Parcels | Points | Score |
|-----------|--------|-------|
| > 10 | 20 | |
| 5 - 10 | 15 | |
| 1 - 4 | 10 | |
| 0 | 0 | |

3. Proximity to Sphere of Influence of an incorporated city.

| | Points | Score |
|----------------------|--------|-------|
| < 1/2 mile | 15 | |
| 1/2 to 1 mile | 10 | |
| 1.1 mile to 2 miles | 5 | |
| 2.1 miles to 4 miles | 2 | |
| > 4 miles | 0 | |

4. Water supply provided from more than one source (i.e. riparian, surface from water district, well).
 Multiple response may apply.

Water source and water right (identify):

| | | Points | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----|--------|-------|
| More than 1 source | Yes | 5 | |
| | No | 0 | |
| 1st priority or adjudicated | Yes | 5 | |
| | No | 0 | |

5. Parcel is located within a region where enrollment will help achieve National, State, or Regional conservation goals and objectives, or enhance existing government or private conservation projects. (Do not include a general plan citation unless it specifically identifies the area of the easement for agricultural conservation).

| | | Points | Score |
|---------------|-----|--------|-------|
| Name of Plan: | Yes | 10 | |
| | No | 0 | |

6. Cooperating Entity has a strategic farmland protection plan with specific agricultural focal areas identified.

| | | Points | Score |
|--|-----|--------|-------|
| | Yes | 15 | |
| | No | 0 | |

7. Unique multifunctional project benefits. Multiple response may apply.

| | Points | Score |
|--|--------|-------|
| Social (identify): | 5 | |
| Economic (identify): | 5 | |
| Climate Change Resiliency (identify): | 5 | |
| Parcel's Access to Ag. Markets (< 5 miles) | 5 | |
| On-site Processing Facilities for Ag. Products | 5 | |

8. Property will protect at-risk species and/or habitat types. Multiple response may apply.

| | | Points | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----|--------|-------|
| At-risk species (Identify): | Yes | 10 | |
| | No | 0 | |

| | | Points | Score |
|------------------------------|-----|--------|-------|
| At-risk habitats (identify): | Yes | 10 | |
| | No | 0 | |

9. Cooperating Entity's experience in managing and enforcing agricultural easements (number of ag. easements held).

| | Points | Score |
|--------------------------|--------|-------|
| > 10 | 10 | |
| 5 - 9 | 5 | |
| 1 - 4 | 3 | |
| 0 | 0 | |
| Bonus: LTA Accreditation | 5 | |

10. Cooperating Entity's average efficiency closing NRCS easements. If no NRCS easements are held, entity must provide evidence of closing efficiency for other easements.

| | Points | Score |
|-----------|--------|-------|
| ≤ 2 years | 15 | |
| > 2 years | 0 | |

11. Cooperating Entity's performance monitoring NRCS easements. If no NRCS easements are held, entity must provide evidence of annual monitoring for other easements.

| | Points | Score |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 100% | 10 | |
| 75 - 99% | 5 | |
| < 75% | 0 | |

12. Letters of Support (NRCS or RCD support letters do not count).

2.5 points per letter (10 pt. max.)

| Points | Score |
|--------|-------|
| 10 | |

13. Landowner has a Conservation Plan, Grazing Management Plan, Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan and is actively implementing conservation practices on the easement offering (plan must be provided to NRCS).

Name of Plan:

Type of Plan:

Date of Plan:

| | Points | Score |
|-----|--------|-------|
| Yes | 5 | |
| No | 0 | |

14. Parcel contains historical or archeological resources that will be protected by the easement (cultural resource must be recognized by SHPO/NRHP, National or State Historic Register).

| | Points | Score |
|-----|--------|-------|
| Yes | 10 | |
| No | 0 | |

Total Points for State Ranking Criteria (200 max. points)

0.0

Total Points for National Ranking Criteria (200 max. points)

0.0

Grand Total for Project (400 max. points)

0.0