

California Department of Conservation

Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP)

Our Mission:

The Division of Land Resource Protection provides information, maps, funding and technical assistance to local governments, consultants, Resource Conservation Districts and non-profit organizations statewide with the goal of conserving the state's agricultural and natural resources.

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP)

The Program:

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program provides consistent, timely and accurate land use data for assessing present status, reviewing trends, and planning for the future of California's agricultural land resources.

For further information, please contact:

California Department of Conservation
Division of Land Resource Protection
Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
801 K Street, MS 18-01
Sacramento, CA 95814-3528
(916) 324-0859
FAX (916) 327-3430

email: fmmp@consvr.ca.gov
www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp

Cover Graphics

Front: Various land uses and their portrayal in the Rural Land Mapping Edition data at the Madera-Fresno county line.

Back: Digital soil data, imagery, and land management information from multiple sources are used in the compilation of Important Farmland Maps. Example from Moorpark, Ventura County.

© 2004, California Department of Conservation

All rights reserved. Fair use of this report for a non-commercial, educational, research or scientific purpose is not a violation of copyright. However, no part of the contents of this report may be reproduced, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, for any purpose without the express written permission of the Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection.

California Farmland Conversion Report 2000 - 2002

*California Department of Conservation
Division of Land Resource Protection*

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

December 2004

Acknowledgements

Many individuals and organizations have contributed to this report and the GIS data from which it was derived.

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Staff
Molly Penberth, Manager
Janet Carey
Patrick Hennessy
Kerri Kisko
Michael Kisko
Sherron Muma
David Patch
Judith Santillan

With the assistance of Rain Ananael, Larelle Burkham-Greydanus, Sam Coe, and Chee Vue.
Thanks also to all past FMMP staff members for their cumulative contributions.

Division of Land Resource Protection
Dennis O'Bryant, Acting Assistant Director
Emily Kishi, Administrative Liaison

Principal Data Sources include soil surveys produced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Service and aerial imagery acquired by the High Altitude Missions Branch of NASA. Current and historic satellite data by permission of SPOT Data Corporation and EROS Data Center. Additional photography sources included AirPhotoUSA and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency.

Cultural base information for the Important Farmland Maps was derived from the U.S. Geological Survey, with updates from Geographic Data Technologies, Inc., and information derived from digital imagery.

Additional data on land management and land use conversion activity was made available from the U. S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Water Resources, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

Map reviewer comments contribute substantially to improving the quality of the information. These reviewers include county and city planning offices, county agricultural commissioners, resource conservation districts, Natural Resources Conservation Service district conservationists, California Farm Bureau Federation, University of California Cooperative Extension, California Cattlemen's Association, local water and irrigation districts, public interest groups, and building industry representatives. Many of these groups also participated in development of the Farmland of Local Importance definitions for their respective counties.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1	The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program 3
	Important Farmland Map Categories..... 5
2	2000-2002 Improvements 7
	Mapping Improvements – Impact on Statistics..... 9
	Rural Land Mapping Pilot Project..... 10
3	Understanding the Data 13
4	Land Use Conversion, 2000-2002 15
	Urbanization..... 16
	Other Changes Affecting Agriculture 20
	Net Land Use Change 24
APPENDIX A	2000-2002 County Conversion Tables 27
APPENDIX B	2000 and 2002 County Acreage Tallies 75
APPENDIX C	County and Regional Conversion Summaries 79
APPENDIX D	Farmland of Local Importance Definitions 83
FIGURES	
	Figure 1 FMMP Survey Area..... 4
	Figure 2 Fresno County Mapping..... 7
	Figure 3 Data Improvement Example..... 9
	Figure 4 Rural Land Mapping Examples..... 11
	Figure 5 Distribution of Rural Land Categories..... 12
	Figure 6 Conversion Table Structure 13
	Figure 7 FMMP Regions..... 14
	Figure 8 Statewide Acreage Change 15
	Figure 9 Sources of Urban Land 2000-2002..... 18
	Figure 10 Urban Air Photo Examples 19
	Figure 11 Land Removed from Irrigated Agriculture 2000-2002 ... 20
	Figure 12 Conversions to Irrigated Farmland 2000-2002..... 22
	Figure 13 Agriculture Air Photo Examples..... 23
	Figure 14 Distribution of Prime Farmland 2002..... 25
TABLES	
	Table 1 Digital Soil Survey Incorporation 8
	Table 2 Top Overall Urban Ranks..... 16
	Table 3 California Farmland Conversion Summary 2000-2002 .. 17
	Table 4 Top Irrigated to Urban Ranks 19
	Table 5 Largest Net Decreases in Irrigated Farmland 24
	Table 6 Largest Net Increases in Irrigated Farmland..... 24

Appendix A: 2000-2002 County Conversion Tables

Table A-1	Alameda	28
Table A-2	Amador	29
Table A-3	Colusa.....	30
Table A-4	Contra Costa	31
Table A-5	El Dorado.....	32
Table A-6	Fresno	33
Table A-7	Glenn.....	34
Table A-8	Imperial.....	35
Table A-9	Kings	36
Table A-10	Lake	37
	Lassen (see Sierra Valley)	61
Table A-11	Los Angeles	38
Table A-12	Madera.....	39
Table A-13	Marin	40
Table A-14	Mariposa	41
Table A-15	Merced	42
Table A-16	Modoc	43
Table A-17	Monterey.....	44
Table A-18	Napa	45
Table A-19	Nevada	46
Table A-20	Orange.....	47
Table A-21	Placer.....	48
	Plumas (see Sierra Valley).....	61
Table A-22	Riverside	49
Table A-23	Sacramento	50
Table A-24	San Benito.....	51
Table A-25	San Bernardino	52
Table A-26	San Diego	53
Table A-27	San Joaquin.....	54
Table A-28	San Luis Obispo	55
Table A-29	San Mateo	56
Table A-30	Santa Barbara	57
Table A-31	Santa Clara.....	58
Table A-32	Santa Cruz.....	59
Table A-33	Shasta.....	60
Table A-34	Sierra Valley (Lassen/Plumas/Sierra).....	61
Table A-35	Siskiyou	62
Table A-36	Solano.....	63
Table A-37	Sonoma	64
Table A-38	Stanislaus.....	65
Table A-39	Sutter	66
Table A-40	Tehama.....	67
Table A-41	Tulare	68
Table A-42	Ventura.....	69
Table A-43	Yolo	70
Table A-44	Yuba	71
Table A-45	Butte - Interim Farmland Area.....	72

Table A-46	Kern - Important Farmland Area	73
Table A-47	Kern - Interim Farmland Area	74

Appendix B: 2000 and 2002 County Acreage Tallies

Table B-1	Important Farmland Acreage Summary 2000	76
Table B-2	Important Farmland Acreage Summary 2002.....	77
Table B-3	Important Farmland Acreage Summary, By Region, 2002.....	78

Appendix C: County and Regional Conversion Summaries

Table C-1	Sources of Urban Land 2000-2002 and Land Committed to Nonagricultural Use.....	80
Table C-2	Irrigated Farmland Changes 2000-2002.....	81
Table C-3	Net Change in Irrigated Land 2000-2002.....	82



Executive Summary

Statewide urban development marginally increased since 1998-2000, but continued its inland encroachment. The San Joaquin Valley's urbanization rate increased more than 75% in 2000-02.

California's urban land expanded by 92,750 acres - about 145 square miles - between 2000 and 2002, as documented by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The best agricultural soils, known as Prime Farmland, had a net decrease of 47,172 acres (74 sq. mi.) and were the source of 21% of statewide urbanization during the period. These summary statistics reflect the contributions of a series of demographic and agricultural trends that are discernable in county level data.

The FMMP biennial mapping survey covers approximately 91% of the privately owned land in the state (45.9 million acres) in 48 counties. Land use information is gathered using air photos, land management data, and other information which is combined with soil quality data in a geographic information system (GIS) to produce maps and statistics. The earliest data for most counties is from 1984.

Urban development continued to shift to inland counties during the 2002 mapping cycle. Nearly 25% of new urban land occurred in the San Joaquin Valley, the inland empire counties of Riverside and San Bernardino accounted for 22%, and the six-county Sacramento metropolitan area absorbed 14% of statewide urban increases. San Diego, Orange, and Sonoma were the only coastal counties represented among the top ten urbanizing list, accounting for 17% of the new urban total.

The most actively growing San Joaquin Valley counties included Kern and San Joaquin (6,265 and 6,211 acres, respectively) followed by Tulare (2,832) and Fresno (2,598). While Kern County experienced development in high desert as well as agricultural areas, 73% of the new urban area in San Joaquin County occurred on irrigated farmland—primarily surrounding Tracy and Stockton.

Two-thirds of the new urban in Tulare County replaced irrigated farmland.

The San Joaquin Valley also represented the largest acreage of Prime Farmland to urban conversion. Ten percent of all new urban land in California had been classified as Prime in San Joaquin Valley counties. A 13% increase in the rate of urbanization of Prime during the 2000-02 period is linked to the greater role inland locations played in supporting California's population growth.

DOCUMENTATION

Detailed reports describing change in each county are available on the FMMP web site:

conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp

Throughout the state, the majority of new urban acreage was devoted to housing and commercial uses. Golf course communities represented substantial acreage in some locations, including approximately 25% of the new urban land in Riverside County. Distribution centers and industrial uses occupied about 18% of the urban increase in San Bernardino County, particularly near the Ontario and Chino airports. Infrastructure to support communities occurred in the form of schools, hospitals, water treatment facilities, landfills, and in the Sacramento area, expansion of Sacramento International Airport.

California's agricultural land use patterns are dynamic, as market demand and resource limitations cause movements in and out of irrigated uses. Market saturation slowed the vineyard development trend of the late 1990's, with the exception of San Luis Obispo County. Orchard planting in the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada and eastern slope of the coast range remained significant, particularly in Glenn County. In continuation of a 1998-00 pattern, irrigated acreage gained in the Antelope Valley area of Los Angeles County, taking advantage of the area's favorable climate to meet strong market demand for baby carrots and potatoes. Two-thirds of the land brought into irrigated uses statewide did not meet Prime Farmland criteria.

Land idling occurred for multiple reasons: Riverside and Sacramento counties exemplified idling in anticipation of urban development, while in Contra Costa County the idled areas were on San Joaquin River Delta islands - in association with ecological restoration or water storage plans. Conversion to dairies and idling of areas with soil and water constraints were responsible for the bulk of this change in Tulare County.

Irrigated farmland also lost ground to the Other Land class, including low-density residential, mining, ecological restoration, and confined animal agriculture uses. This type of change was 34% higher during the 2002 update. Notable ecological restoration conversions involved 4,000 acres of tidally flooded land on Liberty Island (Solano and Yolo counties), and refuge projects in Butte, Glenn, and Tulare counties. Expansion of sand and gravel operations occurred in counties ranging from Riverside to Sonoma, in support of infrastructure for urban development. New or expanded confined animal agricultural facilities were common in Merced and other San Joaquin Valley counties, but also occurred as far north as Glenn County. Rural residential areas that are 10-25 acres in size, and remote developments in wooded areas, were better delineated throughout the project area due to the use of more detailed digital imagery.

In 2002, FMMP initiated the pilot Rural Land Mapping Project to better document conversions to Other Land in four San Joaquin Valley counties. Initial data on this effort is contained in Chapter Two of this report.

Comparing 2000-02 with the prior period, urbanization increased by 1.6%, but losses of irrigated farmland were 28% higher. Despite irrigated farmland expansion in some locations, increased urban development pressure in inland areas and other factors causing land to be removed from farming led to a 53,963 acre net loss in irrigated uses during the two-year cycle.