measures?

selection points (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 15 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 10 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) How close is the site to an urban built-up area? The site is 2 miles or more from an urban built-up area - 15 points The site is more than 1 mile but less than 2 miles from an urban built-up area - 10 points The site is less than 1 mile from, but is not adjacent to an urban built-up area - 5 points The site is adjacent to an urban built-up area - 0 points (6) How close is the site to water lines, sewer lines and/or other local facilities and services whose capacities and design would promote nonagricultural use? None of the services exist nearer than 3 miles from the site - 15 points Some of the services exist more than 1 but less than 3 miles from the site - 10 points All of the services exist within 1/2 mile of the site - 0 points (7) Is the farm unit(s) containing the site (before the project) as large as the average - size farming unit in the County? Colusa Average Farm Size: 608; Glenn Average Farm Size: 389; Yolo Average Farm Size: 484 (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 (8) 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 - 10 points Acreage equal to between 25 and 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 9 to 1 point(s) Acreage equal to less than 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 0 points (9) 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 (10) 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 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

(11) 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 - 10 points

Some reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 9 to 1 point(s)

No significant reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 0 points

(12) 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

# (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

# Rationale

A one mile radius along the levee alignment (in all cardinal directions) includes roughly 12,000 acres

North of the levee alignment = 5,000 acres Approximately 150 are developed (Sugarfield) 5,000 nonurban use - farmland and Settling Basin

East of the levee alignment = 1,500 acres 100% nonurban use

South of levee alignment = 4,500 acres 3,000 urban use 1,500 nonurban

West of levee alignment = 1,000 acres 100% nonurban use

Total Urban 3,000 acres
Total Nonurban 9,000 acres

Approx 3/4 of land within 1 mile radius is nonurban

# Decision

75 percent is eleven (11) points

#### (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

#### Rationale

#### Colusa County, Alt 1:

100% The nearest urban area within Colusa county is the town of Williams, which is approximately 11 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Colusa County, Alt 2:

100% The nearest urban area within Colusa County is the town of Williams, which is approximately 11 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Glenn County, Alt 1

100% The nearest urban area within Glenn County is the town of Willows, which is approximately 7 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Glenn County, Alt 2

100% The nearest urban area within Glenn County is the town of Willows, which is approximately 8 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Yolo County, Alt 1

100% The nearest urban area within Yolo County is Woodland, which is approximately 12 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Yolo County, Alt 2

100% The nearest urban area within Yolo County is Woodland, which is approximately 12 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

Data source: 2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps

#### (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

#### Rationale

# Colusa County, Alt 1:

100% The nearest urban area within Colusa county is the town of Williams, which is approximately 11 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 10 points

#### Colusa County, Alt 2:

100% The nearest urban area within Colusa county is the town of Williams, which is approximately 11 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 10 points

## Glenn County, Alt 1

100% The nearest urban area within Glenn County is the town of Willows, which is approximately 7 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 10 points

## Glenn County, Alt 2

100% The nearest urban area within Glenn County is the town of Willows, which is approximately 8 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 10 points

#### Yolo County, Alt 1

100% The nearest urban area within Yolo County is Woodland, which is approximately 12 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 10 points

## Yolo County, Alt 2

100% The nearest urban area within Yolo County is Woodland, which is approximately 12 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 10 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

## Rationale

## Colusa County, Alt 1:

1 The amount of the project footprint (within Colusa County), which has been farmed more than five of the last 10 years is 1.9% 0 points

# Colusa County, Alt 2:

2 The amount of the project footprint (within Colusa County), which has been farmed more than five of the last 10 years is 1.9% 0 points

# Glenn County, Alt 1

1 The amount of the project footprint (within Glenn County), which has been farmed more than five of the last 10 years is 1.7% 0 points

# Glenn County, Alt 2

2 The amount of the project footprint (within Glenn County), which has been farmed more than five of the last 10 years is 1.7% 0 points

# Yolo County, Alt 1

1 The amount of the project footprint (within Yolo County), which has been farmed more than five of the last 10 years is 91.3% 20 points

# Yolo County, Alt 2

2 The amount of the project footprint (within Yolo County), which has been farmed more than five of the last 10 years is 91.3% 20 points

# (4) Is the site subject to state or unit of local government policies or programs to protect farmland or covered by private

Site is protected - 20 points Site is not protected - 0 points

	Rationale
Colusa County, Alt 1: Site is protected 20 points	11,861 acres of land under Williamson Act contract would be permanently disturbed by project facilities
Colusa County, Alt 2: Site is protected 20 points	11,521 acres of land under Williamson Act contract would be permanently disturbed by project facilities
Glenn County, Alt 1 Site is protected 20 points	2007 acres of land under Williamson Act contract would be permanently disturbed by project facilities
Glenn County, Alt 2 Site is protected 20 points	1816 acres of land under Williamson Act contract would be permanently disturbed by project facilities
Yolo County, Alt 1 Site is protected 20 points	0 acres of land under Williamson Act contract would be permanently disturbed by project facilities
Yolo County, Alt 2 Site is protected 20 points	3 acres of land under Williamson Act contract would be permanently disturbed by project facilities

#### (5) How close is the site to an urban built-up area?

The site is 2 miles or more from an urban built-up area - 15 points

The site is more than 1 mile but less than 2 miles from an urban built-up area - 10 points

The site is less than 1 mile from, but is not adjacent to an urban built-up area - 5 points

The site is adjacent to an urban built-up area - 0 points

#### Colusa County, Alt 1:

> 2 miles The nearest urban area within Colusa county is the town of Williams, which is approximately 11 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Colusa County, Alt 2:

> 2 miles The nearest urban area within Colusa county is the town of Williams, which is approximately 11 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Glenn County, Alt 1

> 2 miles The nearest urban area within Glenn County is the town of Willows, which is approximately 7 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

## Glenn County, Alt 2

> 2 miles The nearest urban area within Glenn County is the town of Willows, which is approximately 8 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

## Yolo County, Alt 1

> 2 miles The nearest urban area within Yolo County is Woodland, which is approximately 12 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

#### Yolo County, Alt 2

> 2 miles The nearest urban area within Yolo County is Woodland, which is approximately 12 miles from the nearest point on the project footprint 15 points

Data source: 2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps

# (6) How close is the site to water lines, sewer lines and/or other local facilities and services whose capacities and design would promote nonagricultural use?

None of the services exist nearer than 3 miles from the site - 15 points Some of the services exist more than 1 but less than 3 miles from the site - 10 points All of the services exist within 1/2 mile of the site - 0 points

# Colusa County, Alt 1:

None No services promoting nonagricultural use were identified within 3 miles of the site 15 points

## Colusa County, Alt 2:

None No services promoting nonagricultural use were identified within 3 miles of the site 15 points

# Glenn County, Alt 1

None No services promoting nonagricultural use were identified within 3 miles of the site 15 points

## Glenn County, Alt 2

None No services promoting nonagricultural use were identified within 3 miles of the site 15 points

# Yolo County, Alt 1

None No services promoting nonagricultural use were identified within 3 miles of the site 15 points

# Yolo County, Alt 2

None No services promoting nonagricultural use were identified within 3 miles of the site 15 points

Data source: Aerial imagery; California Drinking Water System Area Boundaries (SWRCB)

# (7) Is the farm unit(s) containing the site (before the project) as large as the average - size farming unit in the (Average farm sizes in each county are available from the NRCS field offices in each state. Data are from the

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

Source: USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service 2017 Census of Agriculture - County Data. Table

# Colusa County, Alt 1:

1 The average farm size of a farm within the project footprint is 752.7 acres, which is larger than the average size farm in Colusa County (608 acres). 10 points

# Colusa County, Alt 2:

2 The average farm size of a farm within the project footprint is 752.7 acres, which is larger than the average size farm in Colusa County (608 acres). 10 points

#### Glenn County, Alt 1

1 The average farm size of a farm within the project footprint is 342.7 acres, which is smaller than the average size farm in Glenn County (398 acres). 7 points

# Glenn County, Alt 2

2 The average farm size of a farm within the project footprint is 342.7 acres, which is smaller than the average size farm in Glenn County (398 acres). 7 points

# Yolo County, Alt 1

1 The average farm size of a farm within the project footprint is 77.9 acres, which is smaller than the average size farm in Yolo County (484 acres). 0 points

# Yolo County, Alt 2

2 The average farm size of a farm within the project footprint is 77.9 acres, which is smaller than the average size farm in Yolo County (484 acres). 0 points

(8) 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 between 25 and 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 9 to 1 point(s)

#### Rationale

Sources: Appendix E Real Estate Plan of the Final Interim Feasibility Report Used for parcel identification; parcel as proxy for farm size

Of the 40 parcels the proposed project would intersect, 16

APN	Total	Estate Easement Percentage of		
	Parcel	Totals	unfarmable land**	
	Area			
1	234.94	218.406	93%	
2	653.80	596.826	91%	
3	238.17	120.578	51%	
4	635.46	101.316	16%	
5	482.66	443.845	92%	
6	319.32	119.558	37%	
7	39.66	19.154	48%	
8	297.79	288.863	97%	
9	228.76	228.756	100%	
10	80.54	77.747	97%	
11	481.10	278.821	58%	
12	576.48	25.784	4%	
13	9.64	0.000	0%	
14	619.53	0.045	0%	
15	651.82	40.967	6%	
16	651.23	52.130	8%	
17	488.58	20.541	4%	
18	554.14	23.132	4%	
19	378.05	148.759	39%	
20	368.53	224.770	61%	
21	23.65	0.031	0%	

Average percent	43%
-----------------	-----

# \*\*Percentage calculated

The average amount of farmland that will become unfarmable due to the project is 15% Most impacts are to smaller farms on the west side of the project

Decision
43 percent is 10 points

#### (9) Does the site have available adequate supply of farm support services and markets, i.e., farm suppliers, equipment dealers,

All required services are available - 5 points

Some required services are available - 4 to 1 point(s)

No required services are available - 0 points

#### Rationale

$C \cap I$	luca	$C \cap I$	ıntv	ΔΙ	+	1.
L OI	הצנוו	COL	IIIIV	. AI		- 1

Most required services available Farm supplies and equipment dealers available in nearby towns (Williams, Colusa). Nearest identified farmer's markets are ~40 miles away in Corning and Yuba City 3 points

#### Colusa County, Alt 2:

Most required services available Farm supplies and equipment dealers available in nearby towns (Williams, Colusa). Nearest identified farmer's markets are ~40 miles away in Corning and Yuba City 3 points

#### Glenn County, Alt 1

Most required services available Farm supplies and equipment dealers available in nearby towns (Williams, Colusa). Nearest identified farmer's markets are ~40 miles away in Corning and Yuba City 3 points

#### Glenn County, Alt 2

Most required services available Farm supplies and equipment dealers available in nearby towns (Williams, Colusa). Nearest identified farmer's markets are ~40 miles away in Corning and Yuba City 3 points

#### Yolo County, Alt 1

Most required services available Farm supplies and equipment dealers available in nearby towns (Williams, Colusa). Nearest identified farmer's markets are ~40 miles away in Corning and Yuba City 3 points

#### Yolo County, Alt 2

Most required services available Farm supplies and equipment dealers available in nearby towns (Williams, Colusa). Nearest identified farmer's markets are ~40 miles away in Corning and Yuba City 3 points

(10) Does the site hav	ve substantial and well-maintained			
	High amount of on-farm investment - 20 points	Glenn County:	Yolo County:	Glen County
	Moderate amount of on-farm investment - 19 to 1 point(s)	Several ~3400+ square foot building	91.7% of the project is irrigated cropland	Difficult to determine whether some of the buildings are on-farm investments
	No on-farm investment - 0 points	Several ~9000+ square foot building	with irrigation infrastructure	However, up to 35 buildings, 10 of which may be residences and 25 could be farm storage
•		And other smaller structures	20+	or other ancillary structures.
	Rationale	13 total		20+
	Rationale			
Colusa County, Alt 1: 20 points	Approximately 35 structures in total, possibly 10 are residences; leaving 25+ that	are likely agricultural storage or other ancillary str	uctures.	
Colusa County, Alt 2: 20 points	Approximately 35 structures in total, possibly 10 are residences; leaving 25+ than	are likely agricultural storage or other ancillary str	uctures.	
Glenn County, Alt 1 Moderate 13 points	Identified four warehouse-type buildings ranging in size from $^{\sim}3000$ to $^{\sim}9000$ sq	uare feet, several smaller structures of unidentified	I type, and several stock tanks. With a total of approxim	nately 13 sites with improvements, there is considered to be a Moderate amount of on-farm investment in Glenn Count
Glenn County, Alt 2 Moderate 13 points	Identified four warehouse-type buildings ranging in size from ~3000 to ~9000 sq	uare feet, several smaller structures of unidentified	I type, and several stock tanks. With a total of approxim	nately 13 sites with improvements, there is considered to be a Moderate amount of on-farm investment in Glenn County
Yolo County, Alt 1 20 points	As shown in Criterion #3, approximately 91.3% of the project footprint is within	rrigated cropland. Because the project cuts throug	th large swaths of cropland improved with irrigation infr	astructure, there is considered to be a High amount of on-farm investment
Yolo County, Alt 2 20 points	As shown in Criterion #3, approximately 91.3% of the project footprint is within	rrigated cropland. Because the project cuts throug	th large swaths of cropland improved with irrigation infr	rastructure, there is considered to be a High amount of on-farm investment

# (11) Would the project at this site, by converting farmland to nonagricultural use, reduce the demand for farm

Substantial reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 10 points

Some reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 9 to 1 point(s)

No significant reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 0 points

Colusa County, Alt 1:

No signifcant reduction

0 points

Decrease in agricultural production value would be less than 0.1%

Colusa County, Alt 2:

No signifcant reduction

0 points

Decrease in agricultural production value would be less than 0.1%

Glenn County, Alt 1

No signifcant reduction

0 points

Decrease in agricultural production value would be less than 0.1%

Glenn County, Alt 2

No signifcant reduction

0 points

Decrease in agricultural production value would be less than 0.1%

Yolo County, Alt 1

No signifcant reduction

0 points

Decrease in agricultural production value would be less than 0.1%

Yolo County, Alt 2

No signifcant reduction

0 points

Decrease in agricultural production value would be less than 0.1%

Source: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Ch. 30

# (12) 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

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

# Colusa County, Alt 1:

Project increases agricultural water supply reliability, is consistent with agricultural use and would not in itself induce conversion of surrounding farmland. 0 points

## Colusa County, Alt 2:

Project increases agricultural water supply reliability, is consistent with agricultural use and would not in itself induce conversion of surrounding farmland. 0 points

## Glenn County, Alt 1

Project increases agricultural water supply reliability, is consistent with agricultural use and would not in itself induce conversion of surrounding farmland.

0 points

## Glenn County, Alt 2

Project increases agricultural water supply reliability, is consistent with agricultural use and would not in itself induce conversion of surrounding farmland. 0 points

# Yolo County, Alt 1

Project increases agricultural water supply reliability, is consistent with agricultural use and would not in itself induce conversion of surrounding farmland. 0 points

# Yolo County, Alt 2

Project increases agricultural water supply reliability, is consistent with agricultural use and would not in itself induce conversion of surrounding farmland. 0 points

Source: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Ch. 30

#### Site Assessment Criteria Total

Colusa

Colusa	
Criteria	Points
1	15
2	10
3	0
4	20
5	15
6	15
7	10
8	10
9	3
10	20
11	0
12	0

<i>C</i>	Onr

Criteria	Points
1	15
2	10
3	0
4	20
5	15
6	15
7	7
8	10
9	3
10	13
11	0
12	0

#### Yolo

Criteria	Points	
1	15	
2	10	
3	20	
4	20	
5	15	
6	15	
7	0	
8	10	
9	3	
10	20	
11	0	
12	0	

#### Site Assessment Criteria Total

Colusa

Criteria	Points	
1	15	
2	10	
3	0	
4	20	
5	15	
6	15	
7	10	
8	10	
9	3	
10	20	
11	0	
12	0	

Glenn
-------

Criteria	Points				
1	15				
2	10				
3	0				
4	20				
5	15 15				
6					
7	7				
8	10				
9	3				
10	13				
11	0				
12	0				

1010					
Criteria	Points				
1	15				
2	10				
3	20				
4	20				
5	15				
6	15				
7	0				
8	10				
9	3				
10	20				
11	0				
12	0				

Ľ	TOTAL	118	TOTAL	108	TOTAL	128	TOTAL 1	18	TOTAL	108	TOTAL	128	
	Land Evaluation Criteria To	ntal					Land Evaluation Criteria Tot	al					
		46		35		40		46		40		57	
	Land Evaluation + Site Asse	essmen	t				Land Evaluation + Site Asses	ssmen	t				
	Cumulative TOTAL	164		143		168	Cumulative TOTAL	164		148		185	

AVERAGE	158	AVERAGE	166