

[Print](#) [Close](#)

## Ranking Tool Summary

### for FY2016 - Long Leaf Pine Initiative

(Released 01/08/2016 )

#### Description:

#### Land Uses:

Forest

#### Efficiency Score:

Scoring Multiplier: 100.000

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 100 - 66	Medium: 65 - 33	Low: 32 - 1
The conservation practices that will be established in the proposed contract are in the high point score range	The conservation practices that will be established in the proposed contract are in the medium point score range	The conservation practices that will be established in the proposed contract are in the low point score range

#### Optional Notes:

#### National Priorities:

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 250 - 170	Medium: 169 - 90	Low: 89 - 1
The application is in the high point score range for addressing national priorities	The application is in the medium point score range for addressing national priorities	The application is in the low point score range for addressing national priorities

#### Questions:

Number	Question	Points
1	a. Is the program application to support the development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP)? If answer is "Yes", do not answer any other national level questions. If answer is "No", proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section.	250
2	a. Implementing the practices in a Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CNMP)?	15
2	b. Implementing the practices in a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP)?	10
2	c. Reducing impacts from sediment, nutrients, salinity, or pesticides on land adjoining a designated "impaired water body" (TMDL, 303d listed waterbody, or other State designation)?	10
2	d. Reducing the impacts from sediment, nutrients, salinity, or pesticides in a "non-impaired water body"?	10
2	e. Implementing practices that improve water quality through animal mortality and carcass management?	10
3	a. Implementing irrigation practices that reduce aquifer overdraft.	15
3	b. Implementing irrigation practices that reduce on-farm water use?	10
3	c. Implementing practices in an area where the applicant participates in a geographically established or watershed-wide project?	10
3	d. Implementing practices that reduce on-farm water use as a result of changing to crops with lower water consumptive use, the rotation of crops, or the modification of cultural operations?	10

4	a. Meeting on-farm regulatory requirements relating to air quality or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures?	10
4	b. Implementing practices that reduce on-farm emissions of particulate matter (PM2.5, PM10)?	10
4	c. Implementing practices that reduce on-farm generated greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O)?	10
4	d. Implementing practices that increase on-farm carbon sequestration?	10
5	a. Reduce erosion to tolerable limits (Soil "T")?	10
5	b. Increasing organic matter and carbon content, and improving soil tilth and structure?	10
6	a. Implementing practices benefitting threatened and endangered, at-risk, candidate, or species of concern.	10
6	b. Implementing practices that retain wildlife and plant habitat on land exiting the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or other set-aside program?	10
6	c. Implementing practices benefitting honey bee populations or other pollinators?	10
6	d. Implementing land-based practices that improve habitat for aquatic wildlife?	10
7	a. Implementing practices that result in the management control of noxious or invasive plant species on non-cropland?	10
7	b. Implementing practice in an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM)?	10
8	a. Reducing on-farm energy consumption?	10
8	b. Implementing practice(s) identified in an approved AgEMP or energy audit, which meet ASABE S612 criteria?	10
9	a. Enhancement of existing conservation practice(s) or conservation systems already in place at the time the application is received?	10
Total Points		500

**State Issues:**

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 400 - 270	Medium: 269 - 140	Low: 139 - 1
The application is in the high point score range for addressing state resource concerns	The application is in the medium point score range for addressing state resource concerns	The application is in the low point score range for addressing state resource concerns

Questions:

Sub-heading Number	Question Number	Question	Points
1		For questions 1-3, only ONE yes answer may be given (use the appropriate habitat evaluation worksheet).	
	1	The planned habitat is >50 points and at least 60 points higher than the benchmark.	125
	2	The planned habitat is >50 points and at least 40-59 points higher than the benchmark.	100
	3	The planned habitat is >50 points and at least 20-39 points higher than the benchmark.	75
2		For question 4-6, only ONE yes answer may be given.	
	1	The planned area will serve as a >50 ft wide corridor for wildlife travel, regardless of total acreage.	75
	2	The planned area will serve as a 35-49 ft wide corridor for wildlife travel, regardless of total acreage.	50
3		General questions:	
	1	Does this application pertain to land that is contiguous to a protected area	50

		such as a National Forest, Military Base, National Wildlife Refuge, State forest, Heritage Reserve, or land protected by a perpetual conservation easement (e.g. WRP, FRPP, GRP, TNC)?	
	2	Is the field (acreage) where practice installation will take place located within Virginia counties?	100
	3	Will offered area connect two or more blocks of longleaf pine?	25
	4	Are the offered acres adjacent to an existing longleaf pine ecosystem?	25
Maximum Points: 400			Total Points: 625

**Local Issues:**

Scoring Multiplier: 1.000

Scoring Ranges and Results Text:

High: 250 - 170	Medium: 169 - 90	Low: 89 - 1
The application is in the high point score range for addressing local resource concerns	The application is in the medium point score range for addressing local resource concerns	The application is in the low point score range for addressing local resource concerns

**Questions:**

Sub-heading Number	Question Number	Question	Points
	1	Will the project occur within 2 miles of and benefit a species that is in the Toolkit layer T&E species (either DGIF or Natural Heritage)?	125
	2	Will the project benefit Early Successional species in the Quail Action Plan focus District of Chowan Basin?	75
	3	Will the project occur within 2 miles of a listed water (Toolkit layer "T&E Water and improve stream quality?	50
Maximum Points: 250			Total Points: 250

**Selected Resource Concerns and Practices:**

Degraded Plant Condition: Excessive Plant Pest Pressure

- Access Control (472)
- Brush Management (314)
- Conservation Cover (327)
- Early Successional Habitat Development/M (647)
- Firebreak (394)
- Forest Management Plan - Written (106)
- Forest Stand Improvement (666)
- Herbaceous Weed Control (315)
- Prescribed Burning (338)
- Prescribed Burning Plan - Written (112)
- Restoration and Management of Rare and D (643)
- Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)
- Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)
- Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)
- Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)

Degraded Plant Condition: Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health

- Access Control (472)
- Brush Management (314)
- Conservation Cover (327)
- Deep Tillage (324)
- Early Successional Habitat Development/M (647)
- Fence (382)
- Firebreak (394)

Forest Management Plan - Written (106)  
 Forest Stand Improvement (666)  
 Herbaceous Weed Control (315)  
 Prescribed Burning (338)  
 Prescribed Burning Plan - Written (112)  
 Restoration and Management of Rare and D (643)  
 Road/Trail/Landing Closure and Treatment (654)  
 Silvopasture Establishment (381)  
 Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)  
 Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)  
 Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)  
 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat: Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter  
 Access Control (472)  
 Brush Management (314)  
 Conservation Cover (327)  
 Early Successional Habitat Development/M (647)  
 Fence (382)  
 Firebreak (394)  
 Forest Management Plan - Written (106)  
 Forest Stand Improvement (666)  
 Herbaceous Weed Control (315)  
 Prescribed Burning (338)  
 Prescribed Burning Plan - Written (112)  
 Restoration and Management of Rare and D (643)  
 Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)  
 Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)  
 Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)  
 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat: Inadequate Habitat - Food  
 Access Control (472)  
 Brush Management (314)  
 Conservation Cover (327)  
 Early Successional Habitat Development/M (647)  
 Fence (382)  
 Firebreak (394)  
 Forest Management Plan - Written (106)  
 Forest Stand Improvement (666)  
 Herbaceous Weed Control (315)  
 Prescribed Burning (338)  
 Prescribed Burning Plan - Written (112)  
 Restoration and Management of Rare and D (643)  
 Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)  
 Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)  
 Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)  
 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat: Inadequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)  
 Access Control (472)  
 Brush Management (314)  
 Conservation Cover (327)  
 Early Successional Habitat Development/M (647)  
 Fence (382)  
 Firebreak (394)  
 Forest Management Plan - Written (106)  
 Forest Stand Improvement (666)  
 Herbaceous Weed Control (315)  
 Prescribed Burning (338)  
 Prescribed Burning Plan - Written (112)  
 Restoration and Management of Rare and D (643)  
 Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)  
 Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)

Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)  
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)  
Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat: Inadequate Habitat - Water  
Access Control (472)  
Fence (382)  
Forest Management Plan - Written (106)  
Prescribed Burning Plan - Written (112)  
Restoration and Management of Rare and D (643)  
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)

5.2.1.22776