New Mexico- (Las Cruces Field Office) 5/03
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 - 100 Potential Points (26.3% of Total)

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			
1-20%			2 times		
21-30%			difference		
31-40%			in FIRS		
41-50%			%ages		
51-60%					
61-70%			100 pts.		
71-80%			max.		
>80%					
		1. Water Quantity	**Total**		

2. Water Quality - 80 Potential Points (21.1% of Total)

A. Surface Water Pollutants - 40 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	Before	After
<100 Ft.	40		
101-500 ft.	30		
501 - 1320 ft.	20		
1320 - 2640 ft.	10		
>2,640 Ft.	0		
A. Surface Water	**Total**		

B. Ground Water Pollutants - 40 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	Before	After
1 - 10 Ft **or** elimination of any direct discharge into ground water.	40		
10 - 50 Ft.	20		
>51 Ft.	0		
B. Ground Water	**Total**		

New Mexico- (Las Cruces Field Office) 5/03
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) - 180 Potential Points (47.4% of Total)

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. Some example practices are listed below:	Potential Points	Percent of need to be installed.	Points
Soil Erosion			
Irrigation Water Management (449)	5		
Structure for Water Control (587)	15		
Irrigation Land Landleveling (464	5		
Water Quality			
Irrigation Water Management (449)	5		
Irrigation System (441, 442, 443)	5		
Nutrient Management (590)	15		
Water Quantity			
Irrigation Pipeline (430)	15		
Irrigation Water Conveyance (428)	10		
Irrigation Water Management (449)	15		
Irrigation Land Leveling (464)	5		
Irrigation drip system (441)	20		
Irrigation System - Sprinkler (442)	20		
Air			
minimum tillage (329)	20		
Plants			
Irrigation Water Management (449)	15		
Pest Management (595)	15		
Nutrient Management (590)	15		
Animals			
3. Selected Conservation Practices	**Total**		

4. Other Considerations - 20 Potential Points (5.2% of Total)

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	Before Points	After Points
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	10		
B. Treatment of this land has water measuring devices at key areas	10		
4. Other Considerations	**Total**		

_____ _____

Designated Conservationist Date