

New Mexico- (Carlsbad Field Office)
FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Irrigated Cropland

Applicant _____ Farm No. _____ Tract No. _____ CMS Field No's. _____ Date _____
 Tribal Land _____ Non-Tribal Land _____ Preliminary Rating _____ Final Rating _____

1. Water Quantity - Potential Points 150 (30%)

Irrigation Efficiency - Use FIRS to Evaluate				Potential Points	Benchmark Points	After Points
% Efficiency	% of Area in Contract before Treatment	% of Area in Contract After Treatment	After			
1-20%				0		
21-30%				20		
31-40%				40		
41-50%				60		
51-60%				80		
61-70%				100		
71-80%				120		
>80%				150		
1. Water Quantity				Total		

2. Water Quality - Potential Points 100 (20%)

A. Surface Water Pollutants - (50) Points Maximum

There is a probability that runoff water from irrigated fields contains sediment, salt, pesticides, and/or nutrients (or other associated chemicals). Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from entering live waters, or re-entering a shared irrigation system. Points will be awarded based on distance from the end of field to the nearest live waters or re-entry point into a shared irrigation system. If there is no run-off, after points will be 0.

Distance of Surface Run-Off to Live Water	Points	After
<100 Ft.	50	
101 - 500 Ft.	40	
501 - 1,320 Ft.	30	
1,320 - 2,640 Ft.	20	
>2,640 Ft.	0	
A. Surface Water	Total	

B. Ground Water Pollutants - (50) Points Maximum

There is a probability that irrigation water containing salt, pesticides, and/or nutrients (or other associated chemicals) is leaching into the ground water. Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from contaminating ground water, through leaching and direct return flow into wells. Points to be awarded based on depth to the water table, or

Depth to Water Table	Points	After
1 - 10 Ft or elimination of any direct discharge into ground water.	50	
10 - 50 Ft.	30	
50 -100 Ft.	15	
>100 Ft.	0	
B. Ground Water	Total	

New Mexico- (Carlsbad Field Office)
FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Irrigated Cropland

Applicant _____ Farm No. _____ Tract No. _____ CMS Field No's. _____ Date _____
 Tribal Land _____ Non-Tribal Land _____ Preliminary Rating _____ Final Rating _____

3. Selected Conservation Practice(s) - Potential Points 200 (40%)

Any practice used in the ranking criteria and intended to be included in the conservation plan of operations must be cost-shared or have an incentive payment. Higher priority (value) should be given to those practices which address multiple resource concerns, are cost effective, and have longer life spans. Use the Quality Criteria in the FOTG to establish the practices that have an impact on the identified resource concern. Choose only the best irrigation system, if more than one.	Potential Points	Percent of need to be installed.	Points
Soil Erosion			
Irrigation System (LEPA) 442	55		
Irrigation System (DRIP) 441	55		
Irrigation System (LESA) 442	45		
Improved Surface Irrigation System 443	35		
Irrigation Pipeline 430	10		
Irrigation Land Leveling (200cy/ac.+) 464	10		
Critical Area Planting 342	10		
Water Quality			
Critical Area Planting 342	10		
Water Quantity			
Irrigation System (LEPA) 442	55		
Irrigation System (DRIP) 441	55		
Irrigation System (LESA) 442	45		
Improved Surface Irrigation System 443	35		
Irrigation Pipeline 430	10		
Irrigation Land Leveling (200cy/ac.+) 464	10		
Critical Area Planting 342	10		
Air			
Critical Area Planting 342	10		
Plants			
Critical Area Planting 342	10		
3. Selected Conservation Practices	Total		

4. Other Considerations - Potential Points 50 (10%)

Below are some suggested, not required, criteria. If there are other criteria the D.C. wants to recommend based on LWG advice, please include them here.	Potential Points		After Points
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	15		
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	15		
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active sec. 319 project.	10		
D. This land is within a proposed sec. 319 or grant project.	10		

4. Other Considerations	Total		
Water Quantity	150		
Water Quality	100		
Practices	200		
Other	50		
Total	500		
Ranking Number			

Designated Conservationist _____

Date _____