

Appendix 3.14-A
Results and Findings of Land
Evaluation and Site Assessment
Pursuant to the Farmland Protection
Policy Act

Table of Contents

	Page
3.14-A1 Introduction	3.14-A-1
3.14-A2 Fresno to Bakersfield Alternatives	3.14-A-1
3.14-A3 Land Evaluation and Site Assessment	3.14-A-2
3.14-A4 Farmland Conversion Impacts Results.....	3.14-A-3
3.14-A4.1 Findings	3.14-A-4
3.14-A5 References.....	3.14-A-5

Tables

Table 3.14-A-1 Alternative Combinations by County	1
Table 3.14-A-2 LESA Scores by Alternative	3

This page intentionally left blank

3.14-A1 Introduction

This memorandum summarizes the results of the farmland land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section of the California High-Speed Train (HST) Project alternatives, which was performed in compliance with Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) requirements. The purpose of FPPA is to minimize the extent to which federal programs contribute to the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses (7 United States Code 4201). Specifically, the FPPA requires that federal agencies:

- Use criteria (described in this memorandum) to identify and take into account the adverse effects of their programs on the preservation of farmland;
- Consider alternative actions, as appropriate, that could lessen adverse effects; and
- Ensure that their programs, to the extent practicable, are compatible with state and units of local government and private programs and policies to protect farmland.

3.14-A2 Fresno to Bakersfield Alternatives

The Fresno to Bakersfield alternatives pass through four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern). There are 27 possible combinations of alternatives that have been analyzed for the project. Not all alternatives occur in every county, with some counties having more possible combinations of alternatives passing through them than other counties. Since calculations and results from the NRCS are conducted by county, the alternative combinations and results below are discussed on a county by county basis. Table 3.14-A-1 shows the 27 possible alternative combinations by county.

Table 3.14-A-1
 Alternative Combinations by County

Combination Number	Alternatives Included in Combination
Fresno County	
Fresno #1	BNSF
Fresno #2	BNSF + Hanford West Bypass 1
Fresno #3	BNSF + Hanford West Bypass 2
Kings County	
Kings #1	BNSF
Kings #2	BNSF + Corcoran Elevated
Kings #3	BNSF + Corcoran Bypass
Kings #4	Hanford West Bypass 1
Kings #5	Hanford West Bypass 2 + Corcoran Elevated
Kings #6	Hanford West Bypass 2 + Corcoran Bypass
Tulare County	
Tulare #1	BNSF
Tulare #2	Corcoran Elevated
Tulare #3	Corcoran Bypass
Tulare #4	Allensworth Bypass
Tulare #5	Corcoran Elevated + Allensworth Bypass
Tulare #6	Corcoran Bypass + Allensworth Bypass

Table 3.14-A-1
 Alternative Combinations by County

Combination Number	Alternatives Included in Combination
Kern County	
Kern #1	BNSF
Kern #2	Bakersfield South
Kern #3	Bakersfield Hybrid
Kern #4	Wasco-Shafter Bypass
Kern #5	Wasco-Shafter Bypass + Bakersfield South
Kern #6	Wasco-Shafter Bypass + Bakersfield Hybrid
Kern #7	Allensworth Bypass
Kern #8	Allensworth Bypass + Bakersfield South
Kern #9	Allensworth Bypass + Bakersfield Hybrid
Kern #10	Allensworth Bypass + Wasco-Shafter Bypass
Kern #11	Allensworth Bypass + Wasco-Shafter Bypass + Bakersfield South
Kern #12	Allensworth Bypass + Wasco-Shafter Bypass + Bakersfield Hybrid

3.14-A3 Land Evaluation and Site Assessment

As required by the FPPA implementing regulations (7 Code of Federal Regulations Part 658), staff from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and HST Project analysts performed land evaluation and site assessment calculations using the CPA-106 form (for corridor-type projects) to determine an overall farmland conversion score. Using alignment information provided by a Geographic Information System, the NRCS calculated the relative value of each of the alternative corridors as farmland; the NRCS land evaluation calculations and the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) site assessment criteria are presented in Attachments 1 respectively. The NRCS provided separate scores for each county within which the alternatives were located (for example, the BNSF Alternative was assigned separate scores for Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern counties). They also provided land evaluation ratings for the heavy maintenance facilities (HMFs). When land evaluation scores were received from NRCS, project staff calculated site assessment scores for each of the alternative corridors and HMF sites. The total LESA rating for each alternative was determined by adding the land evaluation score (up to 100 points) and site assessment scores (up to 160 points) for each county, and weighting scores based on the percentage of the alignment lying within each county (total possible score of 260). Results were compared to significance thresholds established in the FPPA implementing regulations. Once total LESA scores were determined, farmland effects were evaluated and relative suitability of sites for farmland protection was assessed. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) recommends the following:

1. Sites with the highest combined scores be regarded as most suitable for protection and the sites with the lowest scores as least suitable for protection.
2. Sites receiving a total score of less than 160 need not be given further consideration for protection and no additional sites need to be evaluated.

3. Sites receiving scores totaling 160 or more be given increasingly higher levels of consideration for protection.
4. When making decisions on proposed actions for sites receiving scores totaling 160 or more, the following should be considered:
 - a. Use of land that is not farmland or use of existing structures;
 - b. Alternative sites, locations, and designs that would serve the proposed purpose, but would convert either fewer acres of farmland or other farmland that has a lower relative value; and
 - c. Special siting requirements of the proposed project and the extent to which an alternative site fails to satisfy the special siting requirements as well as the originally selected site.

3.14-A4 Farmland Conversion Impacts Results

Land evaluation and site assessment scores, and total LESA scores, for each of the 27 alternative combinations and HMFs are provided in Table 3.14-A-2.

A majority of the alternative combinations had total LESA scores equal to or greater than 160, with the exception of four in Tulare County. All alternative combinations in Fresno, Kings, and Kern counties had scores above 160. The five HMFs received scores that ranged from 160 for the Fresno Works HMF site to 179 for the Shafter East HMF site.

Table 3.14-A-2
 LESA Scores by Alternative

Alternative Combination Number	Alternatives Included in Combination		
	Land Evaluation Score	Site Assessment Score	Total LESA Score
Fresno County			
Fresno #1	73	105	178
Fresno #2	73	98	171
Fresno #3	73	98	171
Kings County			
Kings #1	57	115	172
Kings #2	57	117	174
Kings #3	57	119	176
Kings #4	66	111	177
Kings #5	66	117	183
Kings #6	55	120	175
Tulare County			
Tulare #1	39	117	156
Tulare #2	39	118	157
Tulare #3	39	115	154
Tulare #4	39	121	160
Tulare #5	39	121	160
Tulare #6	39	120	159

Table 3.14-A-2
 LESA Scores by Alternative

Alternative Combination Number	Alternatives Included in Combination		
	Land Evaluation Score	Site Assessment Score	Total LESA Score
Kern County			
Kern #1	64	114	178
Kern #2	64	115	179
Kern #3	64	116	180
Kern #4	64	118	182
Kern #5	64	120	184
Kern #6	64	119	183
Kern #7	58	110	168
Kern #8	58	112	170
Kern #9	58	110	168
Kern #10	58	114	172
Kern #11	58	115	173
Kern #12	58	114	172
Heavy Maintenance Facilities			
Fresno	85	75	160
Hanford	72	99	171
Wasco	85	84	169
Shafter East	95	84	179
Shafter West	85	83	168

3.14-A4.1 Findings

The FPPA does not mandate that a specific decision be made by a federal agency based on LESA ratings, but provides suitability guidance for protection of farmland from conversion to nonagricultural uses. Based on FPPA guidance, a combination of the BNSF Alternative with the Hanford West Bypass 2, Corcoran Bypass, and Allensworth Bypass alternatives would have the lowest impacts.

1. The Central Valley is primarily devoted to agricultural land uses and is dominated by soils that are well suited for crop production. Therefore, impacts on agriculture lands in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section of the HST Project cannot be completely avoided, although impacts have been avoided and minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures have been proposed in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) to reduce unavoidable impacts.
2. Programmatic environmental reviews have been performed previously, in coordination with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and other federal and state agencies, and concluded that an HST System connecting cities in southern California with the Bay area via the Central Valley would be most likely to meet legislative mandates in the least environmentally damaging manner (California High-Speed Rail Authority [Authority] and Federal Railroad Administration [FRA] 2005, 2008, 2010); and the programmatic documents established that the HST would most effectively be developed in discrete sections. The Fresno to Bakersfield Section EIR/EIS provides a

project-level review of the alternatives that have been proposed to meet the overall HST purpose and need for this segment. The programmatic EIR/EIS recognized that impacts on agricultural resources could be substantial, and some potential alternatives were rejected during the programmatic review because of their effects on agriculture (Authority and FRA 2008). Recognizing the need to protect important agricultural resources to the extent possible, alternatives evaluated in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section would follow existing road and railway alignments to the extent feasible.

3. Siting requirements for the HST System established in the final programmatic EIR/EIS included a segment traveling between Fresno and Bakersfield (Authority and FRA 2010).

Following the completion of the decision-making process, the decision-making agency is requested to return a copy of the farmland conversion calculations to the NRCS for recordkeeping purposes. The FRA, as the decision-making agency for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section of the California HST Project, is expected to complete the FPPA reporting process, following posting of the Record of Decision for the project.

3.14-A5 References

California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration (Authority and FRA). 2005. Final

Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Proposed California High-Speed Train System. Available at:

http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/Statewide_Program_Environmental_Reports_EIR_EIS.aspx. Sacramento, CA, and Washington, DC. August 2005.

California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration (Authority and FRA). 2008, Revised 2010. Final Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST) Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). Available at: http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/ba_cv_program_eir.aspx. Sacramento, CA, and Washington, DC. May 2008, Revised 2010.

California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration (Authority and FRA). 2010a. Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST) Revised Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Available at: http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/ba_cv_program_eir.aspx. Sacramento, CA, and Washington, DC. August 2010.

This page intentionally left blank

Attachment 1
NRCS Land Evaluation Calculations

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>1/1</u>
---	--	--------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
--	--

2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Fresno, California
--	---

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)	1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/1/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
--	---	--

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size 1,153,812 285
--	---

5. Major Crop(s) Grapes, Tomatoes, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 1,250,984 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 597,055 %
--	--	---

8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12
--	---	---

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	913	811	811	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	
C. Total Acres In Corridor	913	811	811	0

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	650	594	510	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	101	114	114	
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0	0	
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)				
	73	73	73	

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	11	11	11	
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	7	7	7	
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	15	15	15	
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20	20	20	
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10	10	
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	12	5	5	
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5	5	
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20	20	
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3	3	
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2	2	
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	105	98	98	0

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	73	73	73	
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	105	98	98	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	178	171	171	0

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>1/2</u>
---	--	--------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Kings, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/8/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 623,700	Average Farm Size 681
5. Major Crop(s) Cotton, Alfalfa, Wheat, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 629,000 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: N/A %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/17/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	923	956	956	895
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	0
C. Total Acres In Corridor	923	956	956	895

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	261	266	238	379
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	492	482	640	289
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0	0	0
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)	57	57	57	66
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	14	14	14	13
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	9	9	9	8
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	17	18	19	17
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20	20	20	20
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10	10	10
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	15	16	17	13
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5	5	5
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20	20	20
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3	3	3
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2	2	2
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	115	117	119	111

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	57	57	57	66
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	115	117	119	111
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	172	174	176	177

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>2/2</u>
---	--	--------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Kings, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/8/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 623,000	Average Farm Size 681
5. Major Crop(s) Cotton, Alfalfa, Wheat, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 629,000 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/17/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	897	898	0	0
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	0
C. Total Acres In Corridor	897	898	0	0

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	386	358		
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	263	410		
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0		
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)				
	66	55		

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	14	14		
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	8	9		
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	17	18		
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20	20		
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10		
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	18	19		
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5		
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20		
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3		
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2		
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	117	120	0	0

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	66	55		
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	117	120	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	183	175	0	0

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>2/2</u>
---	--	--------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Tulare, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/8/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 550,342	Average Farm Size 232
5. Major Crop(s) Corn, Daily, Alfalfa, Citrus	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 638,789 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 867,965 %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	534	549	0	0
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	0
C. Total Acres In Corridor	534	549	0	0

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	0	0		
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	524	537		
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0		
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)				
	39	39		

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	14	14		
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	8	8		
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	14	14		
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20	20		
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10		
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	25	24		
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5		
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20		
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3		
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2		
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	121	120	0	0

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	39	39		
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	121	120	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	160	159	0	0

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part:

DATE

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)		3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>1/3</u>
1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train		5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration	
2. Type of Project High Speed Train		6. County and State Kern, California	
PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/8/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 912,584	Average Farm Size 1,428
5. Major Crop(s) Cotton, Grapes, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 1,054,228 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 703,387 %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	1,368	1,305	1,298	1,216
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	0
C. Total Acres In Corridor	1,368	1,305	1,298	1,216

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	1,142	1,157	1,154	985
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	90	89	89	89
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0	0	0
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)	64	64	64	64
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	11	12	12	12
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	7	6	7	7
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	14	15	15	15
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20	20	20	20
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10	10	10
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	22	22	22	24
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5	5	5
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20	20	20
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3	3	3
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2	2	2
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	114	115	116	118

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	64	64	64	64
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	114	115	116	118
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	178	179	180	182

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>2/3</u>
---	--	--------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Kern, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/8/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 912,584	Average Farm Size 1,428
5. Major Crop(s) Cotton, Grapes, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 1,054,228 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 703,387 %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Stoire Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	1,152	1,146	1,324	1,261
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	0
C. Total Acres In Corridor	1,152	1,146	1,324	1,261

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	1,106	901	1,067	1,040
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	89	89	115	115
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0	0	0
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)	64	64	58	58
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	13	12	11	12
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	7	7	7	7
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	16	16	14	15
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20	20	20	20
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10	10	10
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	24	24	18	18
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5	5	5
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20	20	20
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3	3	3
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2	2	2
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	120	119	110	112

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	64	64	58	58
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	120	119	110	112
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	184	183	168	170

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of 3/3
---	--	--------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Kern, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/8/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 912,584	Average Farm Size 1,428
5. Major Crop(s) Cotton, Grapes, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 1,054,228 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 703,387 %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	1,254	1,172	1,109	1,102
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	0
C. Total Acres In Corridor	1,254	1,172	1,109	1,102

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	1,037	913	933	883
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	115	115	120	115
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0	0	0
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)	58	58	58	58
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	11	12	12	12
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	7	7	7	7
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	14	15	16	15
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20	20	20	20
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10	10	10
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	18	20	20	20
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5	5	5
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20	20	20
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3	3	3
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2	2	2
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	110	114	115	114

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	58	58	58	58
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	110	114	115	114
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	168	172	173	172

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>1</u>
---	--	------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Fresno, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/1/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 1,153,812	Average Farm Size 285
5. Major Crop(s) Grapes, Tomatoes, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 1,250,984 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 597,055 %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	586			
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services				
C. Total Acres In Corridor	586	0	0	0

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	569			
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	0			
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0			
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)				
	85			

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	12			
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	8			
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	15			
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	0			
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10			
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	0			
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5			
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20			
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3			
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2			
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	75	0	0	0

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	85			
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	75	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	160	0	0	0

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>1</u>
---	--	------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Kings, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)		1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/17/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		4. Acres Irrigated 623,700	Average Farm Size 681
5. Major Crop(s) Cotton Alfalfa, Wheat, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 629,000 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: N/A %	
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12	

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	512			
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services				
C. Total Acres In Corridor	512	0	0	0

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	80			
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	310			
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0			
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)	72			
--	-----------	--	--	--

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points				
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	14			
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	6			
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	19			
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20			
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10			
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	0			
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5			
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20			
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3			
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2			
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	99	0	0	0

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	72			
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	99	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	171	0	0	0

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request 5/1/12	4. Sheet 1 of <u>1</u>
---	--	------------------------

1. Name of Project Fresno to Bakersfield High Speed Train	5. Federal Agency Involved Federal Railroad Administration
--	--

2. Type of Project High Speed Train	6. County and State Kern, California
--	---

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)	1. Date Request Received by NRCS 5/17/12	2. Person Completing Form William Reed
--	--	--

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size 912,584 1,428
--	---

5. Major Crop(s) Cotton, Grapes, Almonds	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 1,054, 228 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 703, 387 %
--	---	--

8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used CA Storie Index	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/18/12
--	---	---

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	495	416	476	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services				
C. Total Acres In Corridor	495	416	476	0

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	495	416	476	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	0	0	0	
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0	0	0	
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

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)	85	95	85	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15	15	15	14	
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	10	10	10	
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	19	19	19	
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	0	0	0	
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10	10	10	
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	0	0	0	
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5	5	
8. On-Farm Investments	20	20	20	20	
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	3	3	3	
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	2	2	2	
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	84	84	83	0

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	85	95	85
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	84	84	83
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260	169	179	168

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part: _____ DATE _____

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

This page intentionally left blank