Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool: ID-ACEP-ALE-GSS Program Agreement - 2021
Program: ACEP
Template: ACEP-ALE GSS (Program Agreements)
Last Modified By: Marvin Brown
Pool Status: Draft
Template Status: Active
Last Modified: 02-25-2021

Land Uses

Land Use	Modifier 1	Modifier 2	Modifier 3	Modifier 4	Modifier 5	Modifier 6
Forest	--	--	--	--	--	--
Range	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pasture	--	--	--	--	--	--
Farmstead	--	--	--	--	--	--
Developed Land	--	--	--	--	--	--
Water	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other Rural Land	--	--	--	--	--	--
Associated Ag Land	--	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	**Min %**	**Default %**	**Max %**
Concentrated erosion	0	5	20
Degraded plant condition	5	5	50
Field pesticide loss	0	5	20
Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss	0	5	50
Livestock production limitation	5	5	50
Long term protection of land	35	40	75
Pest pressure	0	5	40
Salt losses to water	0	5	20
Soil quality limitations	0	5	45
Source water depletion	0	5	40
Storage and handling of pollutants	0	5	25
Terrestrial habitat	0	5	40
Wind and water erosion	0	5	10

Concentrated erosion

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels	0	20	100
Classic gully erosion	0	40	100
Ephemeral gully erosion	0	40	100

Degraded plant condition

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant productivity and health	0	50	100
Plant structure and composition	0	50	100

Field pesticide loss

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Pesticides transported to groundwater	0	50	100
Pesticides transported to surface water	0	50	100

Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	20	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	20	100
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to groundwater	0	20	100
Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to surface water	0	20	100
Sediment transported to surface water	0	20	100

Livestock production limitation

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Feed and forage balance	0	50	100
Inadequate livestock shelter	0	5	100
Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution	0	45	100

Long term protection of land

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Threat of conversion	100	100	100

Pest pressure

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant pest pressure	0	100	100

Salt losses to water

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Salts transported to groundwater	0	50	100
Salts transported to surface water	0	50	100

Soil quality limitations

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aggregate instability	0	15	100
Compaction	0	15	100
Concentration of salts or other chemicals	0	15	100
Organic matter depletion	0	20	100
Soil organism habitat loss or degradation	0	20	100
Subsidence	0	15	100

Source water depletion

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Groundwater depletion	0	35	100
Inefficient irrigation water use	0	35	100
Surface water depletion	0	30	100

Storage and handling of pollutants

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Nutrients transported to groundwater	0	20	100
Nutrients transported to surface water	0	20	100
Pesticides transported to surface water	0	20	100
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to groundwater	0	20	100
Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to surface water	0	20	100

Terrestrial habitat

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates	0	100	100

Wind and water erosion

Resouce Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Sheet and rill erosion	0	50	100
Wind erosion	0	50	100

Practices

Practice	Practice Code	Practice Type
Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement	LTPPE	L
Long-Term Protection of Land - Maximum Duration Allowed by State Law	LTPMAS	L
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	L
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search Update	LTAPERSU	L
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	L
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review	LTAPTR2	L

Ranking Component Weights

Category	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Vulnerabilities	Default	5	15	20
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	10
Resource Priorities	Default	35	40	50
Program Priorities	Default	40	40	50
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

Display Group: ID-ACEP-ALE-GSS Program Agreement - 2021- V2 (Draft)

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

Survey: Applicability Questions

Section: Applicability

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is General ALE Parcel in Idaho?	Yes	--
	Otherwise	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is Parcel in Idaho	Yes	--
	Otherwise	--

Survey: Program Questions

Section: National Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Percent of of prime, unique, and important farmland soil in the parcel to be protected	Greater than 80%	15
	Greater than 70%	12
	Greater than 60%	8
	Greater than 50%	4
	Less than 49%	0
Percent of cropland, range land, grassland, historic grassland, pastureland, or nonindustrial private forest land in parcel to be protected	Greater than 50%	15
	Greater than 40%	8
	Greater than 33%	4
	Less than 32%	0
Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average farm size in the county based on USDA Census of Agriculture. (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Ratio greater than 2	15
	Ratio greater than 1	7
	Ratio less than 0.99	0
Decrease in the percentage of acreage of farm and ranch land in the county in which the parcel is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture. (USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Decrease greater than 15 percent	15
	Decrease greater than 10 percent	9
	Decrease greater than 5 percent	5
	Decrease less than 5 percent	1
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.(USDA - NASS - Census of Agriculture)	Acreage decrease of greater than 15%	15
	Acreage decrease of greater than 10%	10
	Acreage decrease of greater than 5%	5
	Acreage decrease of greater than 3%	3
	Acreage decrease of less than 2.99%	0
Ratio of population growth in the county vs statewide population growth as documented by the U.S. Census (Census Bureau Home Page)	County growth rate is more than 3 times the State growth rate	15
	County growth rate is more than 2 times the State growth rate	7
	County growth rate is more than 1 times the State growth rate	4
	County growth rate is less than .99 times the State growth rate	0
Ratio of County population density vs statewide population density as documented by the most recent U.S. Census (Census Bureau Home Page)	County population density is more than 3 times the State density	15
	County population density is more than 2 times the State density	7
	County population density is more than 1 times the State density	4
	County population density is less than 0.99 times the State density	0

Section: National Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations.	Plan is documented and developed by an industry professional	10
	Plan is documented	5
	No plan is documented	0
Proximity of the parcel to other protected land that limits the conversion of the land to nonagricultural use or protects grazing uses and related conservation values.	Adjacent to other protected land	15
	Within 1 mile of other protected land	10
	Within 3 miles of other protected land	5
	None of the above	0
Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure	Adjacent to other agriculture operations and infrastructure	15
	Within 1 mile of other agriculture operations and infrastructure	10
	Within 3 miles of other agriculture operations and infrastructure	5
	None of the above	0
Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use.	Links two noncontinuous corridors of protected agriculture use	20
	A contiguous or proximal expansion of protected agrilculture use	10
	None of the above	0
The land is currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within one year and is grassland that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.	YES	15
	NO	0
Land is grassland of special environmental significance that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.	YES	15
	NO	0
Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that is the eligible entity cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.	Entity contributes 50% of FMV	5
	Entity contributes 25-49% of FMV	3
	Entity contributes 10-24% of FMV	1
	Entity contributes less than 9.99% of FMV	0

Survey: Resource Questions

Section: State and Local Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
50% or more of the offered parcel is located within an Idaho NRCS designated Priority Area	Yes	15
	Otherwise	0
50% or more of the offered parcel is located within a State-of-Idaho Sage-grouse management areas for grasslands of special significance	Core management area	20
	Important management area	12.5
	General management area	5
	Otherwise	0

Section: State and Local Questions

Question	Answer Choices	Points
Is 50% of the offered parcel located in a IDFG Big Game Migration Priority Area	Big Game Migration Priority Area - 50%	6
	Otherwise	0
Does the offered parcel fall within a IDFG Mapped Migration Route *	Mapped Migration Route	14
	Otherwise	0
Parcel contains Mesic Habitat features such as riparian areas, wetlands, and/or mesic wildlife habitat such as streamsides, wet meadows, springs and seeps, irrigated fields, and high elevation habitats.	YES	30
	NO	0
The offered parcel contains a majority of what Mesic and Riparian features?	Mesic habitat associated with wet-meadows, springs, seeps or small stream riparian areas supporting herbaceous and small wood vegetation that provides late season brood rearing habitat for sage grouse.	40
	Moist habitat associated with natural lakes, ponds, or marshes	25
	Ephemeral streams or riparian areas associated with large streams or rivers supporting trees and other riparian vegetation	10
	Area contains no Mesic features	0
Composition of native vegetation in the offered area is	Greater than 75%	30
	Greater than 50%	20
	Greater than 25%	10
	Less than 24.9%	0
Majority of slopes on the offered area are less than 30%	YES	15
	NO	0
Acres being offered border sagebrush range lands on at three thee sides	YES	5
	NO	0
Offered acres are part of an active livestock grazing operation	YES	5
	NO	0
Will an Agriculture Land Easement Plan be developed by the Entity	YES	10
	NO	0
If an ALEP is developed by the Entity how many of the following resource concerns will be addressed: Soil - erosion reduction, condition improvement, or deposition reduction; Water and Air - quality improvement, quantity improvement; Plant - enhancement, improvement, productivity, species composition; Animal - habitat improvement, diveristy improvement, habitat protection; Other - Protect historical and archaeological sites, or develop access to agriculture infrastructures, operations, markets and labor.	ALEP addresses all five resource concerns	10
	ALEP addresses 3 or more concerns	3
	ALEP addresses at least 2 concerns	2
	No ALEP Plan and no concerns addressed	0