



Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor

William C. Burke, Director

April 9, 2007

Amanda Ratliff
FEMA, Region-V
536 South Clark St., 6th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60605-1521

Dear Ms. Ratliff

As you know, IEMA has completed a consultation process with the NRCS to generate a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (form AD-1006) for the Waterloo Community School District seismic resistant high school project. Specifically, this consultation was needed to assess the potential impact of the project on prime or unique farmlands. This process yielded an impact rating of 177 for the Waterloo project.

As you also know, NRCS has informed us that they do not make determinations based upon this rating, but merely assist in completing the rating process. Mike Fausz, of the Monroe County zoning office, participated in the rating process and has explained that the County uses this process to decide if the impact of a project affecting prime or unique farmlands is substantial enough to limit or deny the project. Specifically, projects with a rating of 225 points or higher are denied, projects rated from 224-200 are approved with limitations, and projects rated below 200 are approved without limitation. Mr. Fausz informed me that this meant the County would have no objections to the Waterloo project proceeding. He explained that the site assessment scored very low because of the project's location within the city limits of Waterloo and the proximity to developed areas.

Although we had hoped Mr. Fausz would provide a narrative cover letter along with the completed form which would provide the above information, we did not receive that item in the original mailing and we have been unable to reach Mr. Fausz over the extended holiday weekend to correct the oversight. Given the time constraints we are facing with this project, I am providing this letter to convey the above details from my conversation with Mr. Fausz.

Sincerely,

Russell Tanton
Hazard Mitigation Specialist, IEMA

U.S. Department of Agriculture

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) Date Of Land Evaluation Request 3/28/07

Name Of Project Waterloo School Seismic Resistant Construction Federal Agency Involved Federal Emergency Management Agency

Proposed Land Use High School County And State Monroe County, Illinois, City of Waterloo

PART II (To be completed by NRCS) Date Request Received By NRCS 3/28/07

Does the site 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 Acres Irrigated 0 Average Farm Size 308

Major Crop(s) Corn, Soybeans, Wheat Farmable Land In Govt. Jurisdiction Acres: 215,916 % 89 Amount Of Farmland As Defined In FPPA Acres: 152,991 % 63

Name Of Land Evaluation System Used Monroe County Name Of Local Site Assessment System Monroe County Date Land Evaluation Returned By NRCS 4/2/07

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)

	Alternative Site Rating			
	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	62.3			
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly	0.0			
C. Total Acres In Site	62.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information

A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	24.9
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	37.4
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	6.4
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	15.0

PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion
Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points) 90.2 0 0 0

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(b))

Site Assessment Criteria	Maximum Points	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
1. Area In Nonurban Use					
2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use					
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed					
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government					
5. Distance From Urban Builtup Area					
6. Distance To Urban Support Services					
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average					
8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland					
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services					
10. On-Farm Investments					
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services					
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use					
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS		0	0	0	0

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)

Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	90	0	0	0
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	300	177	0	0	0
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)			0	0	0

Site Selected: _____ Date Of Selection _____ Was A Local Site Assessment Used? Yes No

Reason For Selection: _____

SUBDIVISION WATERLOO PUBLIC SCHOOL

LAND EVALUATION

<u>GROUP</u>	<u>REL. VALUE</u>	<u>ACRES IN GROUP</u>	<u>VALUE</u>
1	100		
2	98	24.9	2440.2
3	86		
4	85	37.4	3179
5	62		
6	61		
7	54		
8	17		
9	0		
		62.3	5619.2
	TOTAL	Ac	VALUE

$$\text{AVG} - \frac{\text{VALUE}}{\text{ACRES}} = \frac{5619.2}{62.3} = 90.20$$

SUBDIVISIONSITE ASSESSMENTFACTOR 1 - AGRICULTURE LAND USE - (WEIGHT - 2.5)

	Ac		
CROPLAND - 10 x	62.3	=	623
PASTURELAND - 5 x		=	
WOOD OR FOREST - 0 x		=	

TOTAL Ac 0 POINTS

$$\text{Avg} = \frac{\text{POINTS}}{\text{Ac}} = \frac{623}{62.3} \times 2.5 = 25$$

FACTOR 2 - LAND IN AGRICULTURE (WEIGHT - 1.3)

(WITHIN 1.5 MI. OF SITE)

90% or more	10 x		
75-89%	9 x		
50-74%	6 x		
25-49%	3 x	1.3 =	3.9
UNDER 25%	0 x		

FACTOR 3 - LAND IN AGRICULTURE ADJACENT TO SITE - (WEIGHT - 1.8)

90% or more	10 x		
75-89%	9 x		
50-74%	6 x	1.8 =	10.8
25-49%	3 x		
UNDER 25%	0 x		

FACTOR 4 - LAND ZONED AGRICULTURE (WEIGHT 1.0)

(WITHIN 1.5 MI. OF SITE)

90% or more	10 x		
75-89%	9 x		
50-74%	6 x		
25-49%	3 x	1 =	3
UNDER 25%	0 x		

SUBDIVISION _____

SITE ASSESSMENT (cont)

FACTOR 5 - AVAILABILITY OF LAND 1.5 MILES
OF NEAREST CITY OR TOWN ZONED
FOR PROPOSED USE (WEIGHT-1.2)

LAND AVAILABLE	10x	
NO LAND AVAILABLE	0x	W3782N CITY

FACTOR 6 - DISTANCE FROM CITY/VILLAGE (WEIGHT-0.8)

OVER 1.5 MILES	10x	
1.5 MILES OR LESS	9x	
1 MILE OR LESS	7x	
0.5 MILE OR LESS	3x	
0.25 MILE OR LESS	0x	0.8 = 0

FACTOR 7 - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED USE (WT-1.9)

ADVERSE IMPACT -	10x	
LITTLE OR NONE (WITH SPCL. DESIGN OR PROT. MEASURES)	5x	1.8 = 9.5
LITTLE OR NONE	0x	

FACTOR 8 - COMPATIBILITY WITH SURROUNDING
AREA AFFECTED (WEIGHT 1.5)

NOT COMPATIBLE	10x	
SOMEWHAT COMPATIBLE	3x	1.5 = 4.5
TOTALLY COMPATIBLE	0x	

FACTOR 9 - IMPACT ON UNIQUE HISTORIC/CULTURAL
FEATURES (WEIGHT 0.2)

ADVERSE IMPACT	10x	
NO IMPACT	0x	0.2 = 0

SUBDIVISIONSITE ASSESSMENT (cont)FACTOR 10 - TRANSPORTATION ACCESSIBILITY (WT.-1.3)

LIMITED ACCESS (mostly rural rds)	10x	
ACCESS TO MAJOR HIGHWAY (OUTSIDE JURISDICTION)	7x	
ACCESS TO MAJOR HIGHWAY (WITHIN JURISDICTION)	3x	1.3 = 3.9
ACCESS TO FULL RANGE (BUS, rail, highway, waterways)	0x	

FACTOR 11 - AVAILABILITY OF CENTRAL SEWER
(WITH ADEQUATE CAPACITY (WEIGHT 0.7))

NONE WITHIN 1.5 MILES	10x	
SEWER LINE WITHIN 1.5 MILES	5x	
SEWER LINE WITHIN 0.25 MILES	0x	0.7 = 0

FACTOR 12 - WATER SUPPLY AVAILABILITY (WEIGHT-0.7)

NO WATER AVAILABLE	10x	
POTENTIAL WATER SUPPLY	5x	
ADEQUATE WATER SUPPLY AVAILABLE AT SITE	0x	0.7 = 0

FACTOR 13 - SOIL SUITABILITY ON SITE FOR
WASTE DISPOSAL (WEIGHT-1.0)

SEPTIC TANKS WILL NOT FUNCTION -	10x	
SPECIAL MANAGEMENT REQUIRED -	5x	
FEW OR NO LIMITATIONS	0x	1 = 0

FACTOR 14 - TOPOGRAPHY (WEIGHT 2.2)

NON-KARST TOPOGRAPHY	10x	2.2 = 22
KARST TOPOGRAPHY	0x	

SUBDIVISION _____

SITE ASSESSMENT (cont)

FACTOR 15 - CONSISTENCY OF PROPOSED USE WITH COUNTY LAND USE PLAN (WEIGHT - 1.5)

INCOMPATIBLE WITH PLAN -	10x	
COMPATIBLE WITH INTENT, BUT NOT WITH PLAN MAP	2x 1.5 =	3
TOTALLY COMPATIBLE	0x	

FACTOR 16 - CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL PLAN (WT. 0.4)

INCOMPATIBLE WITH INTENT OF PLAN	10x	
COMPATIBLE WITH INTENT OF PLAN	3x .4 =	1.2
COMPATIBLE WITH REGIONAL PLAN	0x	

TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

TOTAL LAND EVALUATION 86.8

TOTAL POINTS -

NON-AGRICULTURAL USE - 0 - 200 POINTS

DEVELOPED WITH RESTRICTIONS - 200 - 224 POINTS

PROTECTED FOR AGRICULTURAL USE - 225 - 300 POINTS