

**New Mexico- T. or C. 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 - 40 Potential Points**

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%			0		
21-30%			5		
31-40%			10		
41-50%			15		
51-60%			20		
61-70%			26		
71-80%			32		
>80%			40		
<b>1. Water Quantity</b>			<b>Total</b>		

**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	Benchmark	After
<100 Ft.	10	0	
101 - 500 Ft.	8	0	
501 - 1,320 Ft.	6	0	
1,320 - 2,640 Ft.	4	0	
>2,640 Ft.	2	0	
<b>A. Surface Water</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	

**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	Benchmark	After
1 - 10 Ft or elimination of any direct discharge into ground water.	10	0	
10 - 50 Ft.	6	0	
50 -100 Ft.	3	0	
>100 Ft.	0	0	
<b>B. Ground Water</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	

**New Mexico- T. or C. 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) - 30 Potential Points**

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.	Potential Points	Percent of need to be installed.	Points
<b>Soil Erosion</b>			
Irrigation Land Leveling (464)	5		
<b>Water Quality</b>			
Irrigation Water Conveyance (428)	5		
Irrigation Water Conveyance (430)	5		
<b>Water Quantity</b>			
Irrigation System Trickle (441)	10		
Irrigation System Sprinkler (442)	5		
<b>3. Selected Conservation Practices</b>	<b>Total</b>		

**4. Other Considerations - 10 Potential Points**

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	Benchmark	After Points
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	4	0	
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	3	0	
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active or proposed sec. 319 project.	3	0	
<b>4. Other Considerations</b>	<b>Total</b>	0	

\_\_\_\_\_  
Designated Conservationist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date