

**New Mexico - (Raton Field Office)**  
**FY 2004 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 - (Potential Points 100)**

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	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%	100	
Ecological	SI of 51-75 with upward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%	80	
Site	SI of 51-75 with downward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%	70	
Similarity	SI of 26-50 with upward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%	60	
Index	SI of 26-50 with downward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%	50	
(SI)*	SI of 0-25 with upward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%	40	
	SI of 0-25 with downward trend	%	___ + ___ + ___ =	%	0	
<b>Riparian</b>	Use Attachment 1, 2, or 3	% Quality Bench Mark: _____	% Quality After: _____	%	100	
<b>Grazed Forest:</b>	Use Attachment 4	% Quality Bench Mark: _____	% Quality After: _____	%	100	
<b>1. Plants</b>		Total	100%	Total	100%	<b>Total:</b>

**2. Conservation practice(s) Selection - (Potential Points 120)**

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(sheet &amp; rill); Water(Inefficient use); Plants(Produtivity, health &amp; vigor); Animals(Domestic - Inadequate quantity &amp; quality of feed &amp; water)</b>			
Water development / fence implementing improved grazing mgt-			
Well (642), Trough ( 614), Pipeline (516), Pond (378), Spring Development (574), Fence (382)			
Fence or water developments for:			
1 pasture	<b>10</b>		
2 pastures	<b>20</b>		
3 pastures	<b>30</b>		
4 pastures	<b>40</b>		
5 or more pastures	<b>50</b>		
<b>Soil erosion (Ephemeral gully), Water quantity (Excessive runoff), Plant condition(Invasive plants), Animals(Inadequate quantity or quality of feed)</b>			
Brush mgt.(314)			
% Treated vs Area Needing Treatment X 40 points	<b>40</b>		
Windbreak establishment(380), Range planting(550)	<b>10</b>		
<b>Animals-Fish and Wildlife(Plant community fragmentation)</b>			
Upland wildlife habitat mgt(for at risk species only) 645	<b>10</b>		
<b>Soil erosion (Classic gully)</b>			
Grade Stab. Structure (410) or Diversion (362)	<b>10</b>		
<b>2. Conservation Practice Selection</b>	<b>Total:</b>		

**New Mexico - (Raton Field Office)**  
**FY 2004 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 - (Potential Points 30)**

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	Points - After
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	5	0	
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	5	0	
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active sec. 319 project.	5	0	
D. This land is within a proposed sec. 319 project.	5	0	
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.	10	0	
Prev	5	0	
<b>3. Other Considerations</b>	<b>Total:</b>		

**Points Earned: (After minus Benchmark):** Sec. 1 \_\_\_\_\_ Sec. 2 \_\_\_\_\_ Sec. 3 \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_\*

\*Minimum points for enrollment is - 30

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date