U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Natural Resources Conservation Service

NRCS-CPA-106
(Rev. 1-91)

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS

PART I *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request **12/9/24**	4. Sheet 1 of **2**
1. Name of Project **SR 524 PD&E; FM 437983-1-22-01**	5. Federal Agency Involved **FDOT**	
2. Type of Project **Two-lane to four-lane widening of 3.15 mile roa**	6. County and State **Brevard, County, Florida**	

PART II *(To be completed by NRCS)*	1. Date Request Received by NRCS **12/16/24**	2. Person Completing Form **Josue Aceituno**
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 **19,292** / Average Farm Size **249**
5. Major Crop(s) **Sod; Forage**	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: **38,351** % **5.89**	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: **11,950** % **0.02**
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used **None**	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System **Soil Potential Rating**	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS **12/16/24**

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	**0**	**0**	**0**	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	**0**	**0**	**0**	
C. Total Acres In Corridor	**116.37**	**115.45**	**119.15**	
PART IV *(To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information*				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	**48**	**48**	**48**	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	**0**	**0**	**0**	
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	**0.13**	**0.13**	**0.13**	
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	**24.1**	**24.1**	**24.1**	
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)*	48.4	48.4	48.4	

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**	**1**	**1**	**1**	
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	**25**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services	**5**	**3**	**3**	**3**	
8. On-Farm Investments	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	**25**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	**160**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**0**
PART VII *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	**100**	**48.4**	**48.4**	**48.4**	**0**
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	**160**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**0**
TOTAL POINTS *(Total of above 2 lines)*	**260**	**52.4**	**52.4**	**52.4**	**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?
A	**48.4**	**5/12/2023**	YES ☑ NO ☐

5. Reason For Selection:

Corridor A was selected because it met the drainage requirements for the project, minimized the need for new right-of-way and avoided cultural resource and environmental impacts associated with the other two corridors. The primary difference between the corridors were the pond alternatives.

Signature of Person Completing this Part: Tom Roberts

DATE **12/18/2024**

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

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)
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