



Appendix F

Ranking Criteria Documents

This is an example of the two ranking criteria we used to
1) assess pre-applications, which is expected to be more general and less detailed than the eventual full proposal
and 2) assess the full proposals, which should include significantly more detail than the pre-applications.

Pre-application Ranking Criteria

Ranking definitions 1= Below Expectations; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Great; 4 = Exemplary

1. Business & Whole Farm Planning	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:
Proposal appears likely to encourage long-term commercial agricultural use of the farmland.	-	Notes from reviewer:
Proposal appears well-suited to the size, soils, topography, water availability, and configuration of the property.	-	
Products planned to grow and/or be produced from the farm intended for human or livestock use. Included, but not limited to: food and horticultural crops, feed crops, fiber crops, value-added crops, oil and grain crops, etc.	-	
Applicant has relevant experience and training related to their proposal. This can include trainings, internships, degrees, employment, or more.	-	
Total =	0	
out of 16		
2. Financial Feasibility, Preparation & Achievability	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:
Proposal is well researched. For example, the proposal demonstrates initial research on market demands and appears relevant and able to succeed in the local or regional agricultural economy.	-	Notes from reviewer:
Proposal appears economically feasible: information is provided on how the proposal will be financed. The applicant has demonstrated a reasonable approach to secure financing to acquire the property and execute their farm plan.	-	
Is the applicant prepared to get preapproved for an acquisition loan and/or for a farm business loan if necessary?	-	
Total =	0	
out of 12		
3. Land Stewardship & Conservation	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:
Applicant's pre-application references best land use practices and best management practices for the maintenance and enhancement of soil health and water quality.	-	Notes from reviewer:
Proposal recognizes and is consistent with [for ex: conservation easement, wetland restoration initiatives, forest management plan, etc].	-	
Total =	0	
out of 8		
4. Equitable Opportunity	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:
Provide a definition of historically underserved farming and ranching groups that your selection committee has identified. Until 2025, the USDA used to identify Beginning; Socially Disadvantaged; Veterans; or Limited Resource farmers and ranchers as historically underserved. This definition could be broadened to include LGBTQ and/or various immigration status.		Notes from reviewer:
Ranking: Historically Underseved Farmer/Rancher owner(s) on the title of the property, and is managed by or programmed for HUFR farmers. If the proposal is by a legal entity or joint operation, is at least 50% ownership of the entity or operation held by historically underserved individuals?	0	
Definition: 0 point(s)= Proposal does not meet definition above. 5 points= Proposal includes one HUFR group. 6 points= Proposal includes two HUFR groups. 7 points= Proposal includes three HUFR groups. 8 points= Proposal includes four HUFR groups.		
out of 8		
Total =		0 Overall notes from reviewer:

Full Proposal Ranking Criteria

Ranking definitions 1= Below Expectations; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Great; 4 = Exemplary

1. Business & Whole Farm Planning	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:	
Proposal is likely to encourage long-term commercial agricultural use of the farmland.	-	Notes from reviewer:	
Proposal is well-suited to the size, soils, topography, water availability, and configuration of the property. Products planned to grow and/or be produced from the farm intended for human or livestock use. Included, but not limited to: food and horticultural crops, feed crops, fiber crops, value-added crops, oil and grain crops, etc.	-		
Proposal is well researched. For example, the proposal demonstrates research on market demands, relevant licensing requirements, county codes, and other business planning documents.	-		
Applicant has relevant experience and training related to their proposal. This can include trainings, internships, degrees, employment, or more.	-		
Total =	0		
out of 16			
2. Financial Feasibility, Preparation & Achievability	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:	
Proposal appears economically feasible: documentation is provided on how the proposal will be financed, including a three-year income and expense projection for the proposed operation, and an appropriate scenario analysis.	-	Notes from reviewer:	
The applicant has demonstrated a reasonable approach to secure financing to acquire the property and execute the Business Plan. The applicant is preapproved for an acquisition loan or for a farm business loan.	-		
The proposal's acquisition budget and capital budget have a reasonable approach to servicing the debt and describe their plan for on- and off-farm income, where applicable.	-		
Total =	0		
out of 12			
3. Land Stewardship & Conservation	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:	
Applicant's proposals describes in detail their best land use practices and best management practices for the maintenance and enhancement of the onsite soil health and water quality.	-	Notes from reviewer:	
Proposal addresses how they will enhance the property's conservation values over time, and recognizes Jefferson Land Trust's [ex: conservation easement, wetland enhancement plans, forest management plan, etc].	-		
Total =	0		
out of 8			
4. Equitable Opportunity	Points Possible	Notes from reviewer:	
<i>Provide a definition of historically underserved farming and ranching groups that your selection committee has identified. Until 2025, the USDA used to identify Beginning; Socially Disadvantaged; Veterans; or Limited Resource farmers and ranchers as historically underserved. This definition could be broadened to include LGBTQ and/org various immigration status.</i>		Notes from reviewer:	
Ranking: Historically Underseved Farmer/Rancher owner(s) on the title of the property, and is managed by or programmed for HUFR farmers. If you are a legal entity or joint operation, is at least 50% ownership of the entity or operation held by historically underserved individuals?	0		
Definition: 0 point(s)= Proposal does not meet definition above. 5 points= Proposal includes one HUFR group. 6 points= Proposal includes two HUFR groups. 7 points= Proposal includes three HUFR groups. 8 points= Proposal includes four HUFR groups.			
out of 8			
Total =			0
		Overall notes from reviewer	