

**New Mexico - Clovis Field Office**  
**FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Grazing Lands**

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

**1. Plants - 65 Potential Points (25% of Total)**

| Note: Instructions on separate sheet |  | % Area in Contract Before Treatment | % Area in Contract After Treatment. | Potential Points | Points - Bench Mark | Points - After |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| <b>Rangelands:</b>                   | SI of 76-1 00 w/trend up or not apparent | %                                   | + + =                               | %                | 65                  |                |
| Ecological                           | SI of 51-75 with upward trend            | %                                   | + + =                               | %                | 60                  |                |
| Site                                 | SI of 51-75 with downward trend          | %                                   | + + =                               | %                | 50                  |                |
| Similarity                           | SI of 26-50 with upward trend            | %                                   | + + =                               | %                | 40                  |                |
| Index                                | SI of 26-50 with downward trend          | %                                   | + + =                               | %                | 30                  |                |
| (SI)*                                | SI of 0-25 with upward trend             | %                                   | + + =                               | %                | 20                  |                |
|                                      | SI of 0-25 with downward trend           | %                                   | + + =                               | %                | 0                   |                |
| <b>Riparian</b>                      | Use Attachment 1, 2, or 3                | % Quality Bench Mark:               | % Quality After:                    | %                | N/A                 |                |
| <b>Grazed Forest:</b>                | Use Attachment 4                         | % Quality Bench Mark:               | % Quality After:                    | %                | N/A                 |                |
| <b>1. Plants</b>                     |  | Total                               | 100%                                | Total            | 100%                | <b>Total:</b>  |

**2. Conservation Practice(s) Selection - 170 Potential Points (65% of Total)**

| Any practice used in the ranking criteria and intended to be included in the EQIP Contract must be a cost-shared practice 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. |   | Potential Points | Percent of Need to be Installed | Points - After |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Soil Erosion</b>  |   |                  |                                 |                |
|  | Range Seeding (550)                               | 15               |                                 |                |
|  | Critical Area Treatment (342)                     | 20               |                                 |                |
|  | Erosion Control Structures (362), (410)           | 15               |                                 |                |
| <b>Plants</b>  |   |                  |                                 |                |
|  | Brush Control, Heavy (314)                        | 30               |                                 |                |
|  | Brush Control, Medium (314)                       | 25               |                                 |                |
|  | Brush Control, Light (314)                        | 20               |                                 |                |
|  | Water Development (516), (614), (642)             | 25               |                                 |                |
|  | Fence (382)                                       | 30               |                                 |                |
| <b>Animals</b>   |   |                  |                                 |                |
|  | Prescribed Grazing - Lesser Prairie Chicken (528) | 20               |                                 |                |
|  | Wildlife Water (648)                              | 5                |                                 |                |
|  | Windbreak (380)                                   | 10               |                                 |                |
| <b>Air and Water Quality Practices</b> are addressed in the other resource areas   |   |                  |                                 |                |
| <b>2. Conservation Practice Selection</b>  |   | <b>Total:</b>    |                                 | <b>0</b>       |

**New Mexico - Clovis Field Office**  
**FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Grazing Lands**

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

**3. Other Considerations - 25 Potential Points (10% 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 |  | Points - After |
|--|------------------|--|----------------|
| A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.  | 25               |  |                |
| 1. Lesser Prairie Chicken--Lek must be present on property in EQIP contract  |                  |  |                |
| 2. Prairie Dog--must be an established colony located on property in EQIP and must be maintained   |                  |  |                |
| B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.  | N/A              |  |                |
| C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active sec. 319 project.  | N/A              |  |                |
| D. This land is within a proposed sec. 319 project.  | N/A              |  |                |
| E. 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.      | N/A              |  |                |
|  |                  |  |                |
| <b>3. Other Considerations</b>   | <b>Total:</b>    |  |                |

**NOTE: If application results in no points awarded in Section 1 (similarity index), application will not be funded. Maximum cost share for brush management (314) will not exceed \$50,000 per contract.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Producer** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Designated Conservationist** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**