

New Mexico- (Chama)

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 (30 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%			10		
21-30%			20		
31-40%			30		
41-50%			NA		
51-60%		Irrigation efficiencies in the Chama SWCD will not be realized due to shallow soils, undulating topography	NA		
61-70%			NA		
71-80%			NA		
>80%			NA		
1. Water Quantity			Total		

2. Water Quality - (20) Potential Points

A. Surface Water Pollutants - (10) 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.	10		
101 - 500 Ft.	5		
501 - 1,320 Ft.	2		
1,320 - 2,640 Ft.	0		
>2,640 Ft.	0		
A. Surface Water		Total	

B. Ground Water Pollutants - (10) 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.	10		
10 - 50 Ft.	5		
50 -100 Ft.	2		
>100 Ft.	0		
B. Ground Water		Total	

New Mexico- (Chama)
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 (45 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. Each practice is worth 1 point each time identified.	Potential Points	Percent of need to be installed.	Points
Soil Erosion			
Practice Codes (378, 410, 412, 441, 430, 466, 512, 521)	8		
Water Quality			
Practice Codes (393, 410, 412, 436, 430, 590,)	6		
Water Quantity			
Practice Codes(356, 362, 387, 386, 388, 436, 441, 442 443, 430, 449, 468, 521, 587, 607, 608)	16		
Air			
Practice Codes (466)	1		
Plants			
Practice Codes (324, 393, 441, 442, 443, 484, 590, 512)	8		
Animals			
Practice Codes (378,382, 590, 512, 521)	5		
3. Selected Conservation Practices	Total		

4. Other Considerations - Potential Points (25 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		After Points
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	3		
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	3		
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active sec. 319 project.	4		
D. Proposed contracted area will be treated to eradicate and or prevent infestation of class A and or Class B noxious weeds, as designated by NMDA	15		
4. Other Considerations	Total		

 Designated Conservationist

 Date