

APPENDIX 3.14-B, ATTACHMENT 2: Natural Resources Conservation Service Land Evaluation Explanations and Calculations for Madera County

Merced to Fresno Section: Central Valley Wye Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS

## FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)			3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 4. Sheet 1 of							
1. Name of Project			5. Federal Agency Involved							
2. Type of Project			6. County and State							
PART II (To be completed by NRCS)				1. Date Request Received by NRCS			2. Person Completing Form			
<ol> <li>Does the corridor contain prime, unique statewide or local important farmlan (If no, the FPPA does not apply - Do not complete additional parts of this for</li> </ol>				YES IVI NO II			4. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size			
5. Major Crop(s)		6. Farmable Land in Gov		ernment Jurisdiction		7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA				
		Acres:		%		Acres: %				
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used 9. Name of Lo			Site Assessment System			10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS				
PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)				Alternative Corridor Corridor A Corridor						
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly										
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indi	rectly, Or To Receive	Services								
C. Total Acres In Corridor										
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information										
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland										
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local	Important Farmland									
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Convert										
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt.	Jurisdiction With Same	e Or Higher Relativ	ve Value							
PART V (To be completed by NRCS value of Farmland to Be Serviced of	·		Relative							
PART VI (To be completed by Fed		L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L	Maximum							
Assessment Criteria (These criter	ia are explained in 7	CFR 658.5(c))	Points							
1. Area in Nonurban Use			15					1		
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use			10					1		
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Far	rmed		20							
4. Protection Provided By State	And Local Government	t	20							
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average			10							
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farr	mland		25							
7. Availablility Of Farm Support S	Services		5							
8. On-Farm Investments			20							
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services			25							
10. Compatibility With Existing Ag	gricultural Use		10							
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS			160							
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)										
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)			100							
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)			160							
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)			260							
1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farn Converted by Proje		. Date Of \$	Selection:	4. Was	A Local Si YES <b>[</b>	Ite Assessment Use	}d?		

5. Reason For Selection:

NOTE: Complete a	a form for each	segment with	more than	one Alternate	Corridor
------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------	---------------	----------

NRCS-CPA-106

(Rev. 1-91)

DATE

TE

## **CORRIDOR - TYPE SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

The following criteria are to be used for projects that have a linear or corridor - type site configuration connecting two distant points, and crossing several different tracts of land. These include utility lines, highways, railroads, stream improvements, and flood control systems. Federal agencies are to assess the suitability of each corridor - type site or design alternative for protection as farmland along with the land evaluation information.

(1) How much land is in nonurban use within a radius of 1.0 mile from where the project is intended?
 More than 90 percent - 15 points
 90 to 20 percent - 14 to 1 point(s)
 Less than 20 percent - 0 points

(2) How much of the perimeter of the site borders on land in nonurban use?
More than 90 percent - 10 points
90 to 20 percent - 9 to 1 point(s)
Less than 20 percent - 0 points

(3) How much of the site has been farmed (managed for a scheduled harvest or timber activity) more than five of the last 10 years?

More than 90 percent - 20 points 90 to 20 percent - 19 to 1 point(s) Less than 20 percent - 0 points

(4) Is the site subject to state or unit of local government policies or programs to protect farmland or covered by private programs to protect farmland?
Site is protected - 20 points

Site is not protected - 0 points

(5) Is the farm unit(s) containing the site (before the project) as large as the average - size farming unit in the County ? (Average farm sizes in each county are available from the NRCS field offices in each state. Data are from the latest available Census of Agriculture, Acreage or Farm Units in Operation with \$1,000 or more in sales.) As large or larger - 10 points

Below average - deduct 1 point for each 5 percent below the average, down to 0 points if 50 percent or more below average - 9 to 0 points

(6) If the site is chosen for the project, how much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of interference with land patterns?

Acreage equal to more than 25 percent of acres directly converted by the project - 25 points Acreage equal to between 25 and 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 1 to 24 point(s) Acreage equal to less than 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 0 points

(7) Does the site have available adequate supply of farm support services and markets, i.e., farm suppliers, equipment dealers, processing and storage facilities and farmer's markets?
 All required services are available - 5 points
 Some required services are available - 4 to 1 point(s)
 No required services are available - 0 points

(8) Does the site have substantial and well-maintained on-farm investments such as barns, other storage building, fruit trees and vines, field terraces, drainage, irrigation, waterways, or other soil and water conservation measures? High amount of on-farm investment - 20 points Moderate amount of on-farm investment - 19 to 1 point(s) No on-farm investment - 0 points

(9) Would the project at this site, by converting farmland to nonagricultural use, reduce the demand for farm support services so as to jeopardize the continued existence of these support services and thus, the viability of the farms remaining in the area? Substantial reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 25 points Some reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 1 to 24 point(s) No significant reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 0 points

(10) Is the kind and intensity of the proposed use of the site sufficiently incompatible with agriculture that it is likely to contribute to the eventual conversion of surrounding farmland to nonagricultural use? Proposed project is incompatible to existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 10 points Proposed project is tolerable to existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 9 to 1 point(s) Proposed project is fully compatible with existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 0 points