

## Project Ranking System for the Gallatin, MO 10-7 MLRA

Project Name:

(Remember to include a map of the Project Area with your submission.)

Score	Points Available	Agency and Management Issues				
	1 to 10	<p><b>Agency Merit and Program Relevance</b> -- How important is the project for NRCS or Soil and Water Conservation programs? (Subjective based on programmatic needs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prime Farmland, FRPP, Hydric, HEL, CSP, Slope length, Yields, K, T, CRP, LESA, crop rental rates, yield estimates for RUSLE</li> <li>- Information does not meet user needs</li> </ul> <p>[1] – Low importance; Little or no impact on NRCS/SWCD programs            [5] – Moderate importance            [10] – High importance; Significant impact on NRCS/SWCD programs</p>				
	1 to 10	<p><b>Frequency of Complaints or Appeals/Feedback</b></p> <p>[1] – Complaints/Comments occur rarely (1 or 2 times annually)            [5] – Complaints/Comments occur occasionally (2 to 5 times annually)            [10] – Complaints/Comments occur frequently (&gt;5 times annually)</p>				
	1 to 10	<p><b>Financial / Partnership Inputs</b> -- Are there inputs from other sources or partners, such as funding, staffing, equipment, or technical support?</p> <p>[1] – Little or no partnership involvement.            [5] – Moderate commitment of staff time, equipment, and/or financial/technical support; one partner involved.            [10] – Major commitment of staff time and equipment, and/or financial/technical support; more than one partner involved.</p>				
	1 to 10	<p><b>Efficiency</b> -- How much “bang for the buck” is in this project?</p> <p>[1] – Low. Lots of work for a few acres; e.g., &lt; 300 acres / person-day. Or, few and minor NASIS changes per person-day.            [5] – Moderate. Reasonable return for the labor; 300 to 1000 acres / person-day, numerous NASIS changes per person-day, etc.            [10] – High. Significant changes with minimal effort; &gt;1000 acres / person-day, major NASIS revisions per person-day, etc.</p>				
	1 to 10	<p><b>Acres affected</b> (MLRA basis)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">[1] - &lt;10,000</td> <td style="width: 50%;">[4] - 10,000-30,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>[7] - 30,000-50,000</td> <td>[10] - &gt;50,000</td> </tr> </table>	[1] - <10,000	[4] - 10,000-30,000	[7] - 30,000-50,000	[10] - >50,000
[1] - <10,000	[4] - 10,000-30,000					
[7] - 30,000-50,000	[10] - >50,000					
	1 to 10	<p><b>Benchmark Series</b></p> <p>[1] – Soil is not a benchmark            [10] – Soil is a benchmark</p>				
	1 to 5	<p><b>Age, Duration, and Staff Involved</b></p> <p>Will the proposed project correct/update the technical quality of the original soil survey?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project took 10 or more years to complete</li> <li>- Extensive use of detailees and trainees</li> <li>- Project was compilation of different age and quality of maps</li> <li>- Completed &gt;10 yrs ago</li> </ul> <p>[1] – Meets current standards and is good quality, [2] – Meets standards, but a few inconsistencies noted, [3] – Meets standards, but several inconsistencies noted, [4] – Meets most standards, [5] – Does not meet current technical standards</p>				
	1 to 10	<p><b>Synergy</b> -- Does the project build on other on-going, recent, or upcoming projects?</p> <p>[1] – Does not relate to other projects; brand new problem            [5] – Relates to other projects, but relationship is minimal            [10] – Very closely related to other projects; continues upon work already done/being done</p>				

Score	Points Available	<b>Scientific Merit</b>
1 to 10	1 to 10	<b>Legend Issues and Joins</b> - Differences between states                      - Historical bias [1] – Consistently mapped over the entire MLRA; few join errors [10] – Many join errors or duplicate map units in the MLRA
1 to 5	1 to 5	<b>Map Unit Kind</b> - Phases/variants/taxadjuncts, misc. units                      - Phases (surface texture, slope, erosion, flooding, depositional, etc.) are inconsistently mapped within the MLRA [1] – Classified to the series level [3] – Could be classified to the series level, but are not [5] – Can not be classified to the series level with existing data
1 to 10	1 to 10	<b>Interpretative Issues</b> - Differences in layer depths, restrictive features, depth to saturated zone, map unit composition, flooding frequency of components [1] – Inconsistencies between counties are rare [5] – Inconsistencies between counties are common [10] – Inconsistencies between counties are frequent
1 to 5	1 to 5	<b>Series Age Concept and Classification Issues</b> Date of most recent Official Series Description revision _____ - Series Control Section change    - Classification/Concept change - Property overlap with similar series [1] – Full characterization to depth of 203cm; current classification [5] – Inactive series still being used
1 to 5	1 to 5	<b>Data Population Consistency/ NASIS Data Validation</b> - Regional Consistency - i.e. flooding frequency [1] – Passes Soil Datamart Export validation [5] – Does not pass Soil Datamart Export validation
1 to 5	1 to 5	<b>Line Placement/Landscape Model Issues</b> [1] – Good cartography – line placement fits imagery and conforms to landscape models [3] – Average cartography – line placement fits imagery, landscape/biome model problems [5] – Poor cartography – mixing biomes, soil catenas mapped on different landforms
1 to 10	1 to 10	<b>Lab Data Availability</b> [1] – Data available from more than 20 pedons, with wide physiographic area, well established series, concept consistently mapped throughout MLRA [4] – Data available from 10 to 19 pedons, with wide physiographic area [6] – Data available from 3 to 9 pedons, with moderate physiographic area [8] – Data available from 1 or 2 pedons, with limited physiographic area [10] – No data available; multiple competing series; not described or classified to 2 meters; multiple drainage classes
1 to 10	1 to 10	<b>Scientific Merit --</b> How important is the project for soil science and the soil resource inventory? [1] – Little or no scientific merit [5] – Some merit; minor changes; changes to soils of small extent, etc. [10] – High merit; major advances in scientific knowledge
Total Score		135 - Maximum Score 16 - Minimum Score