

Ranking Pool Report

Ranking Pool FY27 ACEP-ALE
Florida

Program ACEP

Pool Status Active

Tags

Template ACEP-ALE (ProTracts)

Template Status Active

Existing Practice Included No

Last Modified By Sara May

Last Modified 09/28/2026

National Pool No

Include States FL (Admin)

Land Uses and Modifiers

Land Use	Grazed	Wildlife	Irrigated	Hayed	Drained	Organic	Water Feature	Protected	Urban	Aquaculture
Associated Ag Land	--	--	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Crop	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Developed Land	N/A	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Farmstead	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Forest	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Other Rural Land	--	--	--	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Pasture	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Range	--	--	N/A	--	N/A	--	--	--	--	--
Water	N/A	--	N/A	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--

Resource Concern Categories

Categories			
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Animals (Livestock production limitation)	0	5	50
Animals (Terrestrial habitat)	0	--	40
Long term protection of land	35	45	75
Plants (Degraded plant condition)	0	5	50
Plants (Pest pressure)	0	5	40
Soil (Concentrated erosion)	0	5	30
Soil (Soil quality limitations)	0	5	50
Soil (Wind and water erosion)	0	5	40
Water (Field pesticide loss)	0	5	20
Water (Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss)	0	5	50

Categories

Category	Min %	Default %	Max %
Water (Salt losses to water)	0	5	20
Water (Source water depletion)	0	5	40
Water (Storage and handling of pollutants)	0	5	40

Animals (Livestock production limitation)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Livestock Health (Feed and forage balance)	0	40	100
Livestock Health (Inadequate livestock shelter)	0	15	100
Livestock Health (Inadequate livestock water quantity, quality and distribution)	0	45	100

Animals (Terrestrial habitat)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial Habitat (Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates)	0	100	100

Long term protection of land

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

Plants (Degraded plant condition)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant Health (Plant productivity and health)	0	50	100
Plant Health (Plant structure and composition)	0	50	100

Plants (Pest pressure)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Plant Health (Plant pest pressure)	0	100	100

Soil (Concentrated erosion)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Soil Erosion (Bank erosion from streams, shorelines or water conveyance channels)	0	20	100
Soil Erosion (Classic gully erosion)	0	40	100
Soil Erosion (Ephemeral gully erosion)	0	40	100

Soil (Soil quality limitations)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
------------------	-------	-----------	-------

Soil (Soil quality limitations)

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

Soil (Wind and water erosion)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Soil Erosion (Sheet and rill erosion)	0	50	100
Soil Erosion (Wind erosion)	0	50	100

Water (Field pesticide loss)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Water Quality (Pesticides transported to groundwater)	0	50	100
Water Quality (Pesticides transported to surface water)	0	50	100

Water (Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss)

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

Water (Salt losses to water)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Water Quality (Salts transported to groundwater)	0	50	100
Water Quality (Salts transported to surface water)	0	50	100

Water (Source water depletion)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Water Quantity (Groundwater depletion)	0	35	100
Water Quantity (Inefficient irrigation water use)	0	35	100
Water Quantity (Surface water depletion)	0	30	100

Water (Storage and handling of pollutants)

Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Water Quality (Nutrients transported to groundwater)	0	25	100
Water Quality (Nutrients transported to surface water)	0	25	100
Water Quality (Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to groundwater)	0	25	100
Water Quality (Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to surface water)	0	25	100

Practices

Practice Name	Practice Code	Practice Narratives	Practice Type
Acquisition Process - Buy-Protect-Sell Transfer	LTAPBPST	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Ingress Egress	LTAPIE	00N	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	00N	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement	LTPPE	00N	Easements

Ranking Weights

Factors	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: FY27 ACEP-ALE Florida Ranking Pool (Active)



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
Did the applicant apply for ACEP-ALE enrollment?	YES	--
	NO	--

Survey: Category Questions

Section: Category		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
Which enrollment type applies to the proposed easement area being offered for ACEP-ALE?	Grasslands under threat of conversion	--
	Agricultural lands under threat of conversion	--

Survey: FY27 ACEP-ALE Florida Program Questions

Section: Program Questions*		
Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Percent of prime, unique, and important soils in the proposed easement area to be protected?	Proposed easement area has greater than 80%.	25
	Proposed easement area has greater than 70% and less than or equal to 80%.	20
	Proposed easement area has greater than 60% and less than or equal to 70%.	10
	Proposed easement area has greater than 50% and less than or equal to 60%.	5
	Proposed easement area has less than or equal to 50%.	0
2. Percent of cropland, pastureland, grassland, nonindustrial private forestland, and rangeland in the proposed easement area to be protected, when referencing 'USA Annual NLCD - Land Cover' layer?	Proposed easement area has greater than 90%	25
	Proposed easement area has less than or equal to 90%	0
3. Ratio of the total acres of land, in the proposed easement area to be protected, compared to the average farm size in the county according to the most recent USDA Census of Agriculture, when referencing to the 'Census - AgCensus County Stats Average Farm Size' layer?	Greater than 2.0	0
	Greater than 1.5 and less than or equal to 2.0	0
	Greater than 1.0 and less than or equal to 1.5	0
	Less than or equal to 1.0	0
4. Decrease in the percentage of farm and ranch land acreage, in the county in which the parcel is located, between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture:	Decrease of greater than 10%	20
	Decrease greater than 5% and less than or equal to 10%.	10
	Decrease greater than 0% and less than or equal to 5%.	7
	No decrease in percentage	1
	Increase in the percentage of farm and ranch land	0
5. Percent of population growth change, in the county, as documented by the two most recent United States Censuses:	Greater than or equal to 32%	20
	Greater than or equal 15% and less than 32%	12
	Greater than or equal to 4.5% and less than 15%	7
	Greater than or equal to 0% and less than 4.5%	2
	Less than 0%	0

Section: Program Questions*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
6. Population density, of the county where the proposed easement resides, as documented by the most recent United States Census:	Greater than a population of 6000 per square mile	20
	Greater than or equal to a population of 4,000 and less than 6,000 per square mile	18
	Greater than or equal to a population of 2,000 and less than 4,000 per square mile	15
	Greater than or equal to a population of 1,000 and less than 2,000 per square mile	11
	Greater than or equal to a population of 500 and less than 1,000 per square mile	8
	Greater than or equal to a population of 250 and less than 500 per square mile	5
	Less than a population of 250 per square mile	0
7. What is the existence of a farm or ranch succession plan or similar plan established to address agricultural viability for future generations:	Succession plan documented and performed by industry professional	6
	Succession plan	5
	No Succession plan	0
8. Proximity of the proposed easement area to other protected land:	Directly adjacent to an Ag Land Easements PADUS Easement boundary	20
	Directly adjacent to a NRCS easement	20
	Directly adjacent to a Protected Agricultural Land Database (PALD) boundary	20
	Within a 1 mile radius of an Ag Land Easements PADUS Easement boundary	11
	Within a 1 mile radius of a NRCS easement	11
	Within a 1 mile radius of a PALD boundary	11
	Greater than a 1 mile radius and less than a 2 mile radius of an Ag Land Easements PADUS Easement boundary	7
	Greater than a 1 mile radius and less than a 2 mile radius of a NRCS easement	7
	Greater than a 1 mile radius and less than a 2 mile radius of a PALD boundary	7
	Proposed easement area is greater than a 2 mile radius and less than a 5 mile radius of an Ag Land Easements PADUS Easement boundary	2
	Greater than a 2 mile radius and less than a 5 mile radius of a NRCS easement	2
	Greater than a 2 mile radius and less than a 5 mile radius of a PALD boundary	2
	Greater than a 5 mile radius of a PADUS, PALD or NRCS easement boundary	0

Section: Program Questions*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
9. Proximity of the proposed easement area to other agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure:	Directly adjacent (touching along a shared boundary) to agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure	15
	Within 1 mile of agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure	12
	Greater than or equal to 1 mile but less than 3 miles in proximity to agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure	7
	Greater than 3 miles in proximity to agricultural operations and agricultural infrastructure	0
10. What is the proposed easement area ability to maximize the protection of contiguous or proximal acres devoted to agricultural use?	Directly adjacent to a protected agricultural land boundary	25
	Within 1 mile of a protected agricultural land boundary	17
	Greater than a 1 mile and less than 2 miles of a protected agricultural land boundary	10
	Greater than 2 miles and less than a 5 miles of protected agricultural land boundary	3
	Greater than a 5 mile radius of a protected agricultural land boundary	0
11. Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland, pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county in which the proposed easement area is located between the last two USDA Censuses of Agriculture:*	Decreases greater than 15%.	10
	Decrease of greater than 10% and less than or equal to 15%.	5
	Decrease of greater than 5% and less than or equal to 10%.	3
	Decrease of greater than 0% and less than or equal to 5%.	1
	No valid data for county	0
	No decrease	0
11a. (No valid data for #11) Decrease in the percentage of acreage of permanent grassland, pasture, and rangeland, other than cropland and woodland pasture, in the county in which the proposed easement area is located between the last two reported USDA Censuses of Agriculture: *	Decreases greater than 15%.	10
	Decrease of greater than 10% and less than or equal to 15%.	5
	Decrease of greater than 5% and less than or equal to 10%.	3
	Decrease of greater than 0% and less than or equal to 5%.	1
	No decrease	0
12. Eligible entity contributes at least 10% percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement from its own cash resources for payment of easement compensation to the landowner and comes from sources other than the landowner.	YES	10
	NO	0

Survey: FY27 ACEP-ALE Florida Resource Questions

Section: All Categories

Question	Answer Choices	Points
----------	----------------	--------

Section: All Categories

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Does the proposed easement area acres contain a site of cultural or historical significance that is currently listed or was formally determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?	National Historic Places Points - Intersect	5
	Otherwise	0
2. Lead Eligible Entity has demonstrated performance in managing and enforcing easements by monitoring 100 percent of its NRCS easements last fiscal year, per the 'Eligible Entity List - National Ranking - Monitoring and Efficiency - 2026' spreadsheet, on the EPD SharePoint?	YES	15
	NO	0
3. The Lead Eligible Entity has demonstrated efficiency in completing NRCS easement transactions according to the "Eligible Entity - National Ranking - Monitoring and Efficiency - 2026" spreadsheet, on the EPD SharePoint?	Less than 12 months	30
	12-15 months	22
	15-18 months	16
	18-21 months	12
	21-24 months	5
	greater than 24 or N/A	0
4. The producer/landowner has executed and is currently implementing an NRCS contract that includes agricultural and forestry regenerative practices?	YES	20
	NO	0
5. The proposed easement is in an area with a threat of conversion:	High	50
	Moderately High	42
	Moderately Low	33
	Low	19
	Otherwise/No Data	0

Section: Grasslands under threat of conversion*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1a. What percentage of the proposed easement area is located in the 'Very High' priority rating for the Grassland Conversion Risk Area layer?	Greater than or equal to 75%	21
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75%	10
	Greater than or equal to 20% and less than 50%	8
	Less than 20%	0
1b. What percentage of the proposed easement area is located in the 'High' priority value for the Grassland Conversion Risk Area layer?	Greater than or equal to 75% of the easement offered acres intersect the Priority 2 area	10
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75% of the easement offered acres intersect the Priority 2 area	8
	Greater than or equal to 20% and less than 50% of the easement offered acres intersect the Priority 2 area	3
	Less than 20% of the easement offered acres intersect the Priority 2 area	0

Section: Grasslands under threat of conversion*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1c. What percentage of the proposed easement area is located in the 'Moderate' priority rating for the Grassland Conversion Risk Area layer?	Greater than or equal to 75%	8
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75%	3
	Greater than or equal to 20% and less than 50%	1
	Less than 20%	0
1d. What percentage of the proposed easement area is located in the 'Low' priority rating for the Grassland Conversion Risk Area layer?	Greater than or equal to 75%	3
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75%	2
	Greater than or equal to 20% and less than 50%	1
	Less than 20%	0
2. How suitable are the soils for crop cultivation?	90% or more of the soils on the proposed easement acreage are class 1-4	26
	Greater than or equal to 75% and less than 90% of the soils on the proposed easement acreage are class 1-4	17
	Greater than or equal to 50% and less than 75% of the soils on the proposed easement acreage are class 1-4	9
	Less than 50% of the soils on the proposed easement acreage are class 1-4	0
3. Proposed easement area intersects with Federally listed habitat, for at-risk species:	Federally listed endangered species	12
	Federally listed threatened species	8
	Federally listed Proposed Endangered	5
	Federally listed Proposed Threatened	2
	No federally listed at-risk species habitat on proposed easement area	0

Section: Agricultural lands under threat of conversion*

Question	Answer Choices	Points
1. Proposed easement boundary is located within:	Intersects a 1 mile buffer of Urban Area	50
	Intersects a Metropolitan Statistical Area	30
	Intersects a Micropolitan Statistical area	15
	Otherwise	0
2. Proposed easement area proximity to a major transportation corridor:	Directly adjacent (touching along a shared boundary)	30
	Within a 1 mile	20
	Greater than 1 mile and less than 2 miles	15
	Greater than 2 miles radius and less than 5 miles	10
	Greater than 5 miles	0

Detailed Assessments

Name	Type	Jurisdiction	Status
------	------	--------------	--------