

APPENDIX 3.14-B, ATTACHMENT 2:

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

(Rev. 1-91)

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)			of Land Evaluation	4. Sheet 1	4. Sheet 1 of			
1. Name of Project Merced to Fresno: Central Valley Wye		5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration						
2. Type of Project High-Speed Rail			6. County and State Madera County, CA					
PART II (To be completed by NRCS)			1. Date Request Received by NRCS 12/2/16			2. Person Completing Form SW Davis		
 Does the corridor contain prime, unique statewide or lo (If no, the FPPA does not apply - Do not complete add 			YES 🗸 NO	I	4. Acres 292274	Irrigated Average 434	e Farm Size	
. Major Crop(s) Almonds, grapes, pistachios 6. Farmable Landaria Acres: 304			Government Jurisdiction 48 % 22.1			7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 237572 % 17.2		
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Revised Storie Index	9. Name of Local None	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.	THE RESERVE TO A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE P		10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 12/8/16			
PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)			Alternati Corridor A	_	dor For S	Segment	Corridor D	
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly			1743	1805		1640	1744	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services			0	0		0	0	
C. Total Acres In Corridor			1743	1805		1640	1744	
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information								
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland			369	622		462	575	
THE SAME WAS ARREST TO A STATE OF THE SAME			497			558	531	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland			0.28	357				
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt, Unit To Be Converted			38	0.32		33	0.36 37.7	
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Rela PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information Criterion			20/27/19/	37		2004	37.17	
value of Farmland to Be Serviced or Converted (Scale of 0 - 100 Points			65	67		68	65	
PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Co Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained	orridor N	Maximum Points						
Area in Nonurban Use		15	15	15		15	15	
Perimeter in Nonurban Use		10	10	10		10	10	
Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed		20	20	20		20	20	
Protection Provided By State And Local Government		20	20	20		20	20	
Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average		10	0	0		0	0	
Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland			0	0		0	0	
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services			5	5		5	5	
8. On-Farm Investments			20	20		20	20	
9. 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			94	94		94	94	
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)								
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)			65	67		68	65	
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)			94	94		94	94	
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)		260	159	161		162	159	
Corridor Selected: Converted by	570	Date Of	Of Selection: 4. Was A Local Si YES			ite Assessment Used?		
5. Reason For Selection:	1							
Signature of Person Completing this Part:					DAT	Ē		
NOTE: Complete a form for each segment v	uith mare than and	Altamat	a Consider				*	

Clear Form

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)

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 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 - 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