

APPENDIX 3.14-B, ATTACHMENT 1:

Natural Resources Conservation Service Land Evaluation Explanations and Calculations for Merced County

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS

IRCS-CPA-1	06	Ì
(Rev. 1-91)		

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)			of Land Evaluation	Request		4. Sheet 1	of		
1. Name of Project Merced to Fresno: Central Valley Wye 2. Type of Project High-Speed Rail PART II (To be completed by NRCS) 1. Da			5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration						
		6. Cour	6. County and State Merced County, CA						
		1. Date	Request Received b		Person Completing Form				
3. Does the corridor contain prime, unique statewide or local important farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - Do not complete additional parts of this form).		?	YES 🚺 NO]	4. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size 468226 394				
5. Major Crop(s) Almonds, Sweet Potatoes, Tomatoes	6. Farmable Land in Go				rnment Jurisdiction 7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA				
Name Of Land Evaluation System Used	9. Name of Loca	% 41.4 essment System		10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS					
CA Revised Storie Index	None				12/8/				
PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)			Alternat Corridor A		dor For	Segment	Corridor D		
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly			767	947		669	716		
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receiv	e Services		0	0		0	0		
C. Total Acres In Corridor			767	947		669	716		
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evalu	ation Information	1							
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland			348	400		312	350		
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmlan	d		136	191		153	88		
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt.	Jnit To Be Converte	d	0.09	0.11		0.09	0.83		
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Sa	me Or Higher Relat	ive Value	34	28.3		35.9	33.4		
PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information Criterion Relative value of Farmland to Be Serviced or Converted (Scale of 0 - 100 Points)			45	49		43	47		
PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corr		Maximum							
Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in		Points							
Area in Nonurban Use		15	15	15		15	15		
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use		10	10	10		10	10		
Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed			20	20		20	20		
Protection Provided By State And Local Government			20	20		20	20		
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average			3	4		1	5		
Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland			0	0		0	0		
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services		5	5	5		5	5		
8. On-Farm Investments			20	20		20	20		
Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services			3	3		3	3		
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use			1	1		1	1		
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS			97	98		95	99		
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)			2007/97/20	V-ANT-			DATE: Y		
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)			45	49		43	47		
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)			97	98		95	99		
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)		260	142	147		138	146		
Corridor Selected: Z. Total Acres of F	armlands to be	3. Date Of	Selection:	4. Was	A Local S	Site Assessment Us	ed?		
Converted by P	roject:			V15.0					
					VEC	□ NO □			
				YES NO					
5. Reason For Selection:									
Cignature of Dayson Completing this Dady			ID ATE						
Signature of Person Completing this Part:					DAT	ь			
NOTE & L.		* 11							
NOTE: Complete a form for each segment with	n more than one	Alterna	te Corridor						

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