Ranking Criteria for NRCS Easement Programs – Fiscal Year 2022

Application Overview

Any applicant may submit an application for participation in ACEP, EQIP, CSP, or RCPP. The NRCS State Conservationist or Area Director, in consultation with stakeholders including the State Technical Committee, Tribal Conservation Advisory Councils, and Local Work Groups, has developed the following ranking criteria to prioritize and select applications that best address the applicable program purposes and priority natural resource concerns in Vermont.

The NRCS State Conservationist or Area Director will establish application batching periods and select the highest ranked applications for funding, based on applicant eligibility and the NRCS ranking process. In Fiscal Year 2022, NRCS will use its Conservation Assessment Ranking Tool (CART) to assess and rank all eligible applications for NRCS conservation programs.

Inventory and Assessment in CART

CART is a decision support system designed to provide a consistent, replicable framework for the conservation planning process based on geospatially referenced information, client-provided information, field observations, and NRCS conservation planner expertise. CART is designed to assist NRCS conservation planners as they assess site vulnerability and existing conditions, and identify natural resource concerns on a unit of land.

In CART, assessments of existing management and conservation efforts are compared against conservation planning criteria thresholds to determine the level of conservation effort needed to address identified natural resource concerns. The results are then used to inform NRCS conservation planning activities for the client. NRCS also uses CART to consolidate resource data and program information to prioritize program delivery and report outcomes of NRCS investments in conservation.

In general, resource concerns fall into one of three categories for the assessment method used in CART to assess and document a resource concern:

- **Client Input/Planner Observation:** A streamlined list of options is presented to the planner to document the client input and/or planner observation of the resource concerns present. These observations are compared to the conservation planning criteria thresholds.

- **Procedural/Deductive:** A large group of resource concerns fall into this category and are assessed using a resource concern-specific tool or a list of inventory-like criteria. Due to variability in State tools, assessment questions and answers will be broad in nature to allow States to more carefully align them with State conditions.

- **Predictive:** The remaining resource concerns are assessed using a predictive interactive model simulation. The CART systems attempt to replicate the outcomes related to the assessment threshold being met or not compared to the model outputs.

After identifying resource concerns and describing existing conditions, planned conservation practices and activities can be added to the existing condition to determine the state of the proposed management system. Supporting practices that are needed to support primary conservation practices and activities are also identified, but do not add conservation management points to the total.

If the client is interested in financial assistance through an NRCS conservation program, the inventory and assessment information, along with client decisions related to conservation practice adoption, are directly and consistently transferred from the assessment portion of CART to the ranking portion of
CART. Based on the transferred assessment information and the conservation practices proposed for implementation, CART identifies the appropriate program ranking pool(s).

**Ranking in CART**

In general, NRCS program ranking criteria uses the following guiding principles:

- Degree of cost-effectiveness of the proposed conservation practices and activities;
- The level of performance of proposed conservation practices and activities;
- Treatment of multiple resource concerns or national priority resource concerns;
- Magnitude of the environmental benefits resulting from the treatment of resource concerns reflecting the level of performance of proposed conservation practices and activities; and
- Compliance with Federal, State, local or tribal regulatory requirements with regards to natural resources.

CART uses a set of National Ranking Templates developed for each NRCS program and initiative. The National Ranking Templates contain four parameters that are customized for each program to reflect the national level ranking criteria. The four parameters are:

1. **Land Uses** - NRCS has developed land use designations to be used by planners and modelers at the field and landscape level. Land use modifiers more accurately define the land’s actual use and provide another level of specificity and help denote how the land is managed. Land use designations and modifiers are defined in Title 180, National Planning Procedures Handbook, Part 600.

2. **Resource Concerns** - An expected degradation of the soil, water, air, plant, or animal resource base to the extent that the sustainability or intended use of the resource is impaired. Because NRCS quantifies or describes resource concerns as part of a comprehensive conservation planning process, that includes client objectives, human and energy resources are considered components of the resource base.

3. **Practices** - A specific treatment used to address resource concerns, such as structural or vegetative measures, or management techniques, which are planned and implemented in accordance with applicable standards and specifications.

4. **Ranking Component Weights** – A set of five components comprise the ranking score for an individual land-based assessment. The five components are:
   a. **Vulnerability** - Site vulnerability is determined by subtracting the existing condition and existing practice scores from the thresholds. This score is weighted by ranking pool to address the resource concerns prioritized by that ranking pool.
   b. **Planned Practice Effects** - The planned practice effect score is based on the sum of the planned practice on that land unit which addresses the resource concern. This score is weighted by ranking pool to address the resource concerns prioritized by that ranking pool.
   c. **Resource Priorities** - National and State resource priorities are established to address the most critical land and resource considerations and are based on NRCS national and State priorities identified with input from National, State, and local stakeholders.
   d. **Program Priorities** - National and State program priorities are established to maximize program effectiveness and advance program purposes and are based on NRCS national and State priorities identified with input from National, State, and local stakeholders.
e. **Cost Efficiency** – Summation of ‘Planned Practice Points’ divided by the log of the ‘Average Practice Cost’.

NOTE: The points for vulnerability, planned practice effects, and cost efficiency are garnered from the assessment portion of CART.

Vermont created State-specific ranking pools within the above-described National Ranking Template parameters. The State ranking pools contain a set of questions that are divided into the following sections – applicability, category, program questions, and resource questions. Ranking pool customization allows States to focus funding on priority resource concerns and initiatives identified at the State level with input from NRCS stakeholders. Each eligible application may be considered for funding in all applicable ranking pools by program.

**NRCS Resource Concerns**

The following table lists the 47 Resource Concerns NRCS uses during the Conservation Planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>NRCS Resource Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sheet and rill erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wind erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ephemeral gully erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classic gully erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bank erosion from streams, shorelines, or water conveyance channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Subsidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organic matter depletion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Concentration of salts or other chemicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Soil organism habitat loss or degradation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Aggregate instability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ponding and flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Seasonal high-water table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Seeps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Drifted snow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Surface water depletion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Groundwater depletion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Naturally available moisture use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Inefficient irrigation water use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Nutrients transported to surface water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Nutrients transported to groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Pesticides transported to surface water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pesticides transported to groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids, or compost applications transported to surface water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids, or compost applications transported to groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Salts transported to surface water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Easement Program-Specific Information

**Agricultural Conservation Easement Program – Agricultural Land Easements (ACEP-ALE)**

The following ACEP-ALE national ranking criteria are included in the “Program Questions” section of ranking pools for ACEP-ALE, with the weighting of each question based on State-level priorities:

1. Percent of prime, unique, and important soils in the parcel to be protected.
2. Percent of cropland, pastureland, grassland, and rangeland in parcel to be protected.
3. Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture.
4. 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.
5. Percent population growth in the county as documented by the U.S. Census.
6. Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent U.S. Census.
7. Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations.
8. Proximity of the parcel to other protected land.
9. Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure.
10. Maximizing the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use.
11. Is land 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 or is land under a CRP contract that is in transition to a covered farmer or rancher pursuant to 16 U.S.C 3835(f).
12. Land is grassland of special environmental significance that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement.

13. 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 years from the USDA Census of Agriculture.

14. Percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement that is the eligible entity’s own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.

15. Does the applicant meet the NRCS definition of a veteran farmer or rancher (VFR)?

16. Did the applicant participate in the CRP Transition Incentives Program (TIP), and has the land included in the ACEP-ALE application come out of CRP within the last two years?

The following ACEP-ALE State ranking criteria are included in the “Resource Questions” section of ranking pools for ACEP-ALE, with the weighting of each question based on State-level priorities:

1. Inclusion of Prime or Statewide Importance “Footnoted” Soil Types.
2. Other Resource Benefits, such as:
   a. Wildlife habitat protection, air quality and greenhouse gas emission reductions, control of invasive plants, control of gulley erosion, etc.
   b. Improvement of natural values, such as the inclusion of special treatment areas, riparian buffers, presence of state or federal T and E species, or protection of clayplain forest
   c. Public Recreation.
   d. Benefits to the local economy, such as on-farm sales of product, space to hold local events, production of value-added products.
3. Presence of historical or archaeological resources that will be protected by easement area.

**Agricultural Conservation Easement Program – Wetland Reserve Easement (ACEP-WRE)**

The following ACEP-WRE ranking criteria are included in the “Program Questions” section of ranking pools for ACEP-WRE, with the weighting of each question based on State-level priorities:

1. Proximity to permanently protected land resources such as: Federal or State forest and wildlife lands; permanently protected lands in conservation easements; located within or adjacent to a VT Priority Watershed; Vermont Class I wetland, targeted Lake Champlain Basin acquisition wetland, or part of a multi-landowner WRE project or a targeted wetland restoration area.
2. Working Lands for Wildlife: Wood turtle or Spotted turtle habitat improved.
3. Type of project
4. Landowner and partner contributions
5. Estimated wetland restoration cost per acre (USDA and partner share)
6. Estimated easement cost per acre.
7. Cost-benefit comparison.
8. Existence of existing easement of any type currently proposed on any of the land being proposed for enrollment?

The following ACEP-WRE ranking criteria are included in the “Resource Questions” section of ranking pools for ACEP-WRE, with the weighting of each question based on State-level priorities:

1. Percent of wetland hydrology altered, multiplied by the percent of altered hydrology that can be restored.
2. Size of the hydrologically restored wetland area in acres.
3. Dominant type of land to be restored.
4. Restored wetland buffer and project type: Percent of easement area that will be restored wetland or eligible riparian areas.
5. Species and habitat enhancement criteria.
6. Does the project restore rare or unique habitat types?
7. Location in relation to surface waters.
8. Will sources of sediment, animal wastes, or other contaminants to surface or groundwater be eliminated?
9. Level of management for (operation and maintenance) required for the restored wetland or upland buffer.