

## 2015 Maine ACEP-ALE National Ranking Criteria

\* Nationally Mandated Factors

<b>1. Percent of Prime, Statewide Important and Local Important Farmland Soils to be protected</b>	
<i>Prime, unique, &amp; Important</i>	<i>Amount above 50% 0.4 multiplier</i>
0.4 points for every % point above 50% (maximum 16pts)	x 0.4
Points: <input type="text" value="0"/>	

<b>2. Are landowners a historically underserved group, small-scale farmer, limited resource landowner, new or beginning farmer or veteran?</b>	
<i>Landowner demographic</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Yes	3
No	0
Points: <input type="text" value="0"/>	

<b>3. Percent of cropland, pastureland and grassland in the parcel to be protected:</b>	
<i>% in Parcel</i>	<i>Points:</i>
less than 33%	0
exactly 33%	4
greater than 33% but less than or equal to 50%	8
greater than 50%	16
Points: <input type="text" value="0"/>	

<b>4. Ratio of the total acres of land in the parcel to be protected to average farm size in the county according to the 2012 USDA Census of Agriculture (0 points for a ratio of 1 or less; 7 points for ratios of 1.1 to 2.0; and 15 points for ratios of greater than 2.0)</b>				
<i>County</i>	<i>Avg Farm Size</i>	<i>Easement Offered Area</i>	<i>Calculate the ratio per parcel</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Androscoggin	128			
Aroostook	392			
Cumberland	87			
Franklin	127			
Hancock	132			
Kennebec	129			
Knox	94			
Lincoln	92			
Oxford	137			
Penobscot	167			
Piscataquis	230			
Sagadahoc	88			
Somerset	242			
Waldo	206			
Washington	380			
York	83			
				Points: <input type="text" value="0"/>

5. 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 (2012 - 2007). (0 points for decrease of 0 percent or less, 1 points for decreases of 0 to 5 percent, 5 points for decrease of 5 to 10 percent, 9 points for decreases of 10 to 15 percent, 15 points for decreases of more than 15 percent)

County	% Change	Ranking Points	Points:
Androscoggin	16.9	0	
Aroostook	-6.6	5	
Cumberland	21.2	0	
Franklin	21.3	0	
Hancock	1.2	0	
Kennebec	-5.3	5	
Knox	-2.3	1	
Lincoln	5.2	0	
Oxford	9.5	0	
Penobscot	-1.4	1	
Piscataquis	37.1	0	
Sagadahoc	7.9	0	
Somerset	25.7	0	
Waldo	91.5	0	
Washington	-5.9	5	
York	8.7	0	
			Points: 0

6. Percent population growth in the county as documented by the US Census (2000-2010). (0 points for growth rate of less than the State growth rate (4.19%), 4 points for growth rate of one to two times the State growth rate, 7 points for growth rate of two to three times the State growth rate, 15 points for growth rate of more than three times the State growth rate)

County	% Population Growth	Ranking Points	Points:
Androscoggin	3.80%	0	
Aroostook	-2.80%	0	
Cumberland	6.00%	4	
Franklin	4.40%	4	
Hancock	5.10%	4	
Kennebec	4.30%	4	
Knox	0.30%	0	
Lincoln	2.50%	0	
Oxford	5.60%	4	
Penobscot	6.20%	4	
Piscataquis	1.70%	0	
Sagadahoc	0.20%	0	
Somerset	2.60%	0	
Waldo	6.90%	4	
Washington	-3.20%	0	
York	5.60%	4	
			Points: 0

7. Population density (population per square mile) as documented by the most recent United States Census (2010). (0 points for population density less than the State population density (43.1), 4 points for population density of 1 to 2 times the State population density, 7 points for population density of 2 to 3 times the State population density, 15 points for population density of greater than 3 times the State population density)

<i>County</i>	<i>Population Density</i>	<i>Ranking Points</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Androscoggin	230.2	15	
Aroostook	10.8	0	
Cumberland	337.2	15	
Franklin	18.1	0	
Hancock	34.3	0	
Kennebec	140.8	15	
Knox	108.8	7	
Lincoln	75.6	4	
Oxford	27.8	0	
Penobscot	45.3	4	
Piscataquis	4.4	0	
Sagadahoc	139.1	15	
Somerset	13.3	0	
Waldo	53.1	4	
Washington	12.8	0	
York	199.0	15	
			Points: 0

8. Existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address farm viability for future generations. (0 points for no plan, 7 points for a plan, 15 points for plan documented and performed by industry professional)

<i>Succession Plan</i>	<i>Points:</i>
No Plan	0
Some type of Plan	7
Plan developed by professional	15
Points: 0	

9. Proximity of the parcel to other protected land, including military installations. (0 points easement offer area (EOA) boundary greater than 3 miles from the protected land boundary, 4 points EOA is greater than 1 mile but less than 3 miles from protected land, 7 points EOA is within 1 mile of protected land boundary, 15 points EOA boundary adjoins protected land boundary)

<i>Easement Offered Area (EOA): Protected Land Proximity</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Is greater than 3 miles from other protected property	0
Is greater than 1 mile but less than 3 miles from other protected property	4
Is within 1 mile of other protected property	7
Adjoins other protected property	15
Points: 0	

10. Proximity of the parcel to other agricultural operations and infrastructure. (0 points if EOA boundary greater than 3 miles in proximity, 4 points if EOA is greater than 1 miles but less than 3 miles in proximity, 7 points EOA is within 1 mile in proximity, 15 points EOA boundary adjoins)

<i>Easement Offered Area (EOA): Ag Operation Proximity</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Is greater than 3 miles from other agriculture infrastructure/operations	0
Is greater than 1 mile but less than 3 miles from ag infrastruce/operations	4
Is within 1 mile of other ag infrastructure/operations	7
Adjoins other ag infrastructure/operations	15
Points:	0

11. Parcel ability to maximize the protection of contiguous acres devoted to agricultural use (15 points if the parcel links two noncontinuous corridors of protected agricultural use, 6 points parcel expands agricultural use protected area, 0 points parcel does not increase a protected agricultural use area)

<i>Easement Offered Area (EOA): Ag Operation Proximity</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Does not increase a protected agriculture use area	0
Expands agricultural use protected area	6
Links two noncontinuous corridors of protected agricultural use	15
Points:	0

12. Parcel contains historical or archaeological resources that will be protected by the easement area.

<i>Historical/Archaeological Resources</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Yes	15
No	0
Points:	0

13. The grassland in the parcel will benefit from the protection under the long-term easement.

<i>Grassland Protection</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Yes	15
No	0
Points:	0

14. Currently enrolled in CRP in a contract that is set to expire within a year and is grassland that would benefit from protection.

<i>CRP Enrollment</i>	<i>Points:</i>
Yes	15
No	0
Points:	0

**Total National Points:**

# 2015 Maine ACEP - ALE Ranking Criteria

## \* State Criteria

<b>1. Multifunctional benefits. Is the offered parcel part of an area of recognized special ecological value or environmental protection concern:</b>		
<i>Special Concern</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Points</i>
Public water supply area	20	
Includes Perennial Stream Riparian Area	20	
Has an architectural, archeological, or other property eligible for the National Register of Historic Places	20	
Zoned for Agricultural Use	20	
Located in a 303(d)(1) Impaired Watershed	20	
Includes wetlands identified by the National Wetland Inventory	10	
Currently provides public education & recreation opportunities	10	
Designated Coastal Zone area	10	
Known habitat for State R, T & E species	10	
NRCS Conservation Practices installed within the past 10 years	10	
Points:		

<b>2. Entity Past Performance</b>		
<i>Agreements &amp; Easement Management</i>		<i>Points</i>
For FY2014, entity performed all required easement monitoring and provided reports prior to the end of the Fiscal Year.	50	
Entity has an existing Cooperative Agreement more than 2 years beyond the execution date	-10	
Entity failed to perform or provide NRCS 25% or more of the required Monitoring Reports from the previous Fiscal Year	-20	
Points:		

<b>Total State Points:</b>
----------------------------