Appendix B - Farmland Conversion Impact Rating

DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INC.

May 6, 2004

Mr. Ray McPhail
US Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources and Conservation Service
Joliet Field Office
606 West Front Avenure
Joliet, MT 59041

SUBJECT: **BELFRY NORTH EA**
F STPP 72-1(1) 10 CN 1016 Control no. 1016
Updated USDA NRCS-CPA-106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Forms

Dear Mr. McPhail:

Please find the enclosed revised USDA NRCS CPA-106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating forms for Corridor Type Projects prepared for the above referenced project. David Evans and Associates, Inc., project consultant, is managing the project for the Montana Department of Transportation

NRCS Parts II and IV on the enclosed USDA NRCS CPA-106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating forms were revised per your direction with the information you provided by phone on May 5, 2004. As you requested, the following changes were made to your original determinations, dated December 11, 2003:

- Part IV A – Represents total acreage of Prime and Unique Farmland as defined in FPPA for Carbon County (taken from Part II #7).
- Part IV B – Represents total acreage of Statewide and Local Important Farmland as defined in FPPA for Carbon County (taken from Part II #7).
- Part IV C – Is the percentage of farmland in county or local government to be converted by the project (Part III C/Part II #6).
- Part IV D – Is the percentage of farmland in Government jurisdiction with the same or higher relative value (Part II #6 – Part IV C).

Parts I, III, VI, and VII on these updated forms were completed by David Evans and Associates. The information for these sections did not change from the December 11, 2003 forms.

This letter will serve as project documentation of your revisions to the CPA 106 forms for this project. These changes have been completed as indicated on the attached forms. Please contact me at (720) 946-0969 if you have any questions.

1331 17th Street Suite 900 Denver Colorado 80202 Telephone: 720.946.0969 Facsimile: 720.946.0973

Sincerely,

DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Richard J. Garcia
GIS Analyst/Planner

Copies: Tom Martin, MDT
Debra Perkins-Smith, DEA
File

Attachments/Enclosures: Revised NRCS-CPA-106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects

File Name P:\MDOT0000-0013 Belfry North\ADMIN\Transmittals\nrcs_CPA-106_coverletter_may2004.doc

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 11/18/03	4. Sheet 1 of 3 Form #1
1. Name of Project Belfry North EA	5. Federal Agency Involved FHWA (MDT)	
2. Type of Project Transportation/Highway Corridor	6. County and State Carbon County, MT	

PART II *(To be completed by NRCS)*	1. Date Request Received by NRCS 12/11/03	2. Person Completing Form A. Ray McPhail
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 85,780 / Average Farm Size 160
5. Major Crop(s) Sugar beets, malt barley, beans, hay	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: 160,837 15 %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 221,152 21 %
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used NA	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System NA	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 5/5/04

PART III *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*	Alternative Corridor For Segment Belfry Area (32ft and 40ft)			
	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	25	16	26	16
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services	0	0	0	0
C. Total Acres In Corridor	25	16	26	16
PART IV *(To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information*				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	39,596	39,596	39,596	39,596
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	181,556	181,556	181,556	181,556
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0 (<1%)	0 (<1%)	0 (<1%)	0 (<1%)
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	14	14	14	14
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)*	54	54	54	54

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	15	15	15	15
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	6	4	6	4
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	18	14	18	14
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	0	0	0	0
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	5	5	5	5
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	0	0	0	0
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services	5	4	4	4	4
8. On-Farm Investments	20	5	3	5	3
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	1	0	1	0
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	1	0	1	0
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	55	45	55	45
PART VII *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	54	54	54	54
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	55	45	55	45
TOTAL POINTS *(Total of above 2 lines)*	260	109	99	109	99

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used?
See 5			YES ☐ NO ☑

5. Reason For Selection:

The Railroad Alignment Alternative - Corridor A and C has been selected as the preferred alignment because it relocates the highway away from the Belfry school to the west side of town providing improved safety. A preferred typical section (32-ft vs. 40-ft) has not been identified at this time.

Signature of Person Completing this Part: Ray J Gain DATE 5-5-04

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

Belfry North EA - Belfry Area Segment Farmland Conversion

Question 1: How much land is in non-urban use within a 1.0 mile radius from where the project is intended?

Site	Alternative	Non-Urban Area (ac)	Area within a 1 mile radius of the project area (ac)	% of Area that is Non-Urban Land
A	Railroad 32-ft	5,133.02	5,275.70	97.30%
B	Broadway 32-ft	5,133.02	5,275.70	97.30%
C	Railroad 40-ft	5,133.02	5,275.70	97.30%
D	Broadway 40-ft	5,133.02	5,275.70	97.30%

Question 2: How much of the perimeter of the site borders on land in non-urban use?

Site	Alternative	Total Perimeter (ft)	Perimeter Bording Non-Urban Land (ft)	% of Perimeter Bordering Non-Urban Land
A	Railroad 32-ft	36,188.50	24,800.75	68.53%
B	Broadway 32-ft	45,755.73	20,783.10	45.42%
C	Railroad 40-ft	36,332.90	24,843.30	68.38%
D	Broadway 40-ft	45,770.81	20,791.00	45.42%

Question 3: How much of the site has been farmed more than 5 of the last 10 years?

Site	Alternative	Total Area (ac)	Farmed Area (ac)	% of the site farmed
A	Railroad 32-ft	24.74	21.45	86.70%
B	Broadway 32-ft	15.90	11.32	71.19%
C	Railroad 40-ft	25.72	22.26	86.55%
D	Broadway 40-ft	16.02	11.35	70.85%

Question 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	Alternative	Yes/No
A	Railroad 32-ft	No
B	Broadway 32-ft	No
C	Railroad 40-ft	No
D	Broadway 40-ft	No

Question 5: Is the farm unit(s) containing the site as large as the average-size farming unit in the county?

Site	Alternative	average size farm in county (ac)	median impacted farm size (ac)	% of the average size farm in the county
A	Railroad 32-ft	1,181.00	851.06	72.06%
B	Broadway 32-ft	1,181.00	851.06	72.06%
C	Railroad 40-ft	1,181.00	851.06	72.06%
D	Broadway 40-ft	1,181.00	851.06	72.06%

Question 6: How much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of interference with land patterns?

Site	Alternative	total area	non-farmable area	% of the total area that becomes non-farmable
A	Railroad 32-ft	24.74	0	0.00%
B	Broadway 32-ft	15.90	0	0.00%
C	Railroad 40-ft	25.72	0	0.00%
D	Broadway 40-ft	16.02	0	0.00%

Question 8: Does the site have farm investments?

Site	Alternative	total area	area of farm investments	% of the site that has farm investments
A	Railroad 32-ft	24.74	7.08	28.62%
B	Broadway 32-ft	15.90	2.71	17.04%
C	Railroad 40-ft	25.72	7.27	28.27%
D	Broadway 40-ft	16.02	2.71	16.92%

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	4. Sheet 1 of 3 Form #2
1. Name of Project **Belfry North EA**	5. Federal Agency Involved **FHWA (MDT)**	
2. Type of Project **Transportation/Highway Corridor**	6. County and State **Carbon County, MT**	

PART II *(To be completed by NRCS)*	1. Date Request Received by NRCS **12/11/03**	2. Person Completing Form **A. Ray McPhail**
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 **85,780** / Average Farm Size **160**
5. Major Crop(s) **Sugar beets, malt barley, beans, hay**	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction **Acres: 160,837 15 %**	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA **Acres: 221,152 21 %**
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used **NA**	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System **NA**	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS **5/5/04**

PART III *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*	Maximum Points	Alternative Corridor For Segment Rural Corridor 32-ft Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly		87	92	96	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services		8	9	8	
C. Total Acres In Corridor		95	101	104	0
PART IV *(To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information*					
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland		39,596	39,596	39,596	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland		181,556	181,556	181,556	
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted		0 (<1%)	0 (<1%)	0 (<1%)	
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value		14	14	14	
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)*		54	54	54	
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	15	15	15	
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	6	7	7	
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	18	19	20	
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	2	3	2	
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services	5	4	4	4	
8. On-Farm Investments	20	3	5	7	
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	0	1	1	
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	0	1	1	
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	48	55	57	0
PART VII *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	54	54	54	
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	48	55	57	0
TOTAL POINTS *(Total of above 2 lines)*	260	102	109	111	0

1. Corridor Selected: **See 5**	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES ☐ NO ☑

5. Reason For Selection:

The Modified Existing Alignment Alternative - Corridor A has been selected as the preferred alignment because it provides the similar safety improvements to the other alternatives but with fewer impacts. A preferred typical section (32-ft vs. 40-ft) has not been identified at this time.

Signature of Person Completing this Part: [signature] DATE 5-5-04

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

Belfry North EA - Rural Corridor - 32ft - Segment Farmland Conversion

Question 1: How much land is in non-urban use within a 1.0 mile radius from where the project is intended?

Site	Alternative	Non-Urban Area (ac)	Area within a 1 mile radius of the project area (ac)	% of Area that is Non-Urban Land
A	Modified Existing 32-ft	14,036.37	14,578.25	96.28%
B	Ridgeway North 32-ft	14,036.37	14,578.25	96.28%
C	Ridgeway South 32-ft	14,036.37	14,578.25	96.28%

Question 2: How much of the perimeter of the site borders on land in non-urban use?

Site	Alternative	Total Perimeter (ft)	Perimeter Bording Non-Urban Land (ft)	% of Perimeter Bordering Non-Urban Land
A	Modified Existing 32-ft	195,141.33	97,233.59	49.83%
B	Ridgeway North 32-ft	180,312.00	92,960.68	51.56%
C	Ridgeway South 32-ft	177,982.84	92,413.07	51.92%

Question 3: How much of the site has been farmed more than 5 of the last 10 years?

Site	Alternative	Total Area (ac)	Farmed Area (ac)	% of the site farmed
A	Modified Existing 32-ft	86.60	74.31	85.81%
B	Ridgeway North 32-ft	92.22	82.63	89.60%
C	Ridgeway South 32-ft	95.58	86.25	90.24%

Question 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	Alternative	Yes/No
A	Modified Existing 32-ft	No
B	Ridgeway North 32-ft	No
C	Ridgeway South 32-ft	No

Question 5: Is the farm unit(s) containing the site as large as the average-size farming unit in the county?

Site	Alternative	average size farm in county (ac)	median impacted farm size (ac)	% of the average size farm in the county
A	Modified Existing 32-ft	1,181.00	180.50	15.28%
B	Ridgeway North 32-ft	1,181.00	180.50	15.28%
C	Ridgeway South 32-ft	1,181.00	180.50	15.28%

Question 6: How much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of interference with land patterns?

Site	Alternative	total area	non-farmable area	% of the total area that becomes non-farmable
A	Modified Existing 32-ft	86.60	8.31	9.60%
B	Ridgeway North 32-ft	92.22	9.08	9.85%
C	Ridgeway South 32-ft	95.58	8.31	8.69%

Question 8: Does the site have farm investments?

Site	Alternative	total area	area of farm investments	% of the site that has farm investments
A	Modified Existing 32-ft	86.60	17.04	19.68%
B	Ridgeway North 32-ft	92.22	25.31	27.45%
C	Ridgeway South 32-ft	95.58	34.61	36.21%

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	4. Sheet 1 of 3 Form #3
1. Name of Project **Belfry North EA**	5. Federal Agency Involved **FHWA (MDT)**	
2. Type of Project **Transportation/Highway Corridor**	6. County and State **Carbon County, MT**	
PART II *(To be completed by NRCS)*	1. Date Request Received by NRCS **12/11/03**	2. Person Completing Form **A. Ray McPhail**
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 **85,780** / Average Farm Size **160**
5. Major Crop(s) **Sugar beets, malt barley, beans, hay**	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: **160,837** **15** %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: **221,152** **21** %
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used **NA**	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System **NA**	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS **5/5/04**

PART III *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*		Alternative Corridor For Segment Rural Corridor 40-ft			
		Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly		92	97	100	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services		8	9	8	
C. Total Acres In Corridor		100	106	108	0
PART IV *(To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information*					
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland		39,596	39,596	39,596	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland		181,556	181,556	181,556	
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted		0 (<1%)	0 (<1%)	0 (<1%)	
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value		14	14	14	
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)*		54	54	54	
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	15	15	15	
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10	6	7	7	
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20	19	19	20	
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	2	3	2	
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services	5	4	4	4	
8. On-Farm Investments	20	3	5	7	
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	0	1	1	
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	0	1	1	
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	49	55	57	0
PART VII *(To be completed by Federal Agency)*					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100	54	54	54	
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160	49	55	57	0
TOTAL POINTS *(Total of above 2 lines)*	260	103	109	111	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?
See 5			YES ☐ NO ☑

5. Reason For Selection:

The Modified Existing Alignment Alternative - Corridor A has been selected as the preferred alignment because it provides the similar safety improvements to the other alternatives but with fewer impacts. A preferred typical section (32-ft vs. 40-ft) has not been identified at this time.

Signature of Person Completing this Part: [signature] DATE 5-5-04

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

Belfry North EA - Rural Corridor - 40ft - Segment Farmland Conversion

Question 1: How much land is in non-urban use within a 1.0 mile radius from where the project is intended?

Site	Alternative	Non-Urban Area (ac)	Area within a 1 mile radius of the project area (ac)	% of Area that is Non-Urban Land
A	Modified Existing 40-ft	14036.37	14578.25	96.28%
B	Ridgeway North 40-ft	14036.37	14578.25	96.28%
C	Ridgeway South 40-ft	14036.37	14578.25	96.28%

Question 2: How much of the perimeter of the site borders on land in non-urban use?

Site	Alternative	Total Perimeter (ft)	Perimeter Bording Non-Urban Land (ft)	% of Perimeter Bordering Non-Urban Land
A	Modified Existing 40-ft	196,398.28	97,986.55	49.89%
B	Ridgeway North 40-ft	181,832.00	93,725.52	51.55%
C	Ridgeway South 40-ft	179,312.36	93,179.82	51.97%

Question 3: How much of the site has been farmed more than 5 of the last 10 years?

Site	Alternative	Total Area (ac)	Farmed Area (ac)	% of the site farmed
A	Modified Existing 40-ft	91.85	80.26	87.38%
B	Ridgeway North 40-ft	96.97	87.01	89.73%
C	Ridgeway South 40-ft	100.32	90.62	90.33%

Question 4: Is the site subject to state or unit of local government policies or programs to protect farmland or covered by

Site	Alternative	Yes/No
A	Modified Existing 40-ft	No
B	Ridgeway North 40-ft	No
C	Ridgeway South 40-ft	No

Question 5: Is the farm unit(s) containing the site as large as the average-size farming unit in the county?

Site	Alternative	average size farm in county (ac)	median impacted farm size (ac)	% of the average size farm in the county
A	Modified Existing 40-ft	1,181.00	180.50	15.28%
B	Ridgeway North 40-ft	1,181.00	180.50	15.28%
C	Ridgeway South 40-ft	1,181.00	180.50	15.28%

Question 6: How much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of interference with land patterns?

Site	Alternative	total area	non-farmable area	% of the total area that becomes non-farmable
A	Modified Existing 40-ft	91.85	8.11	8.83%
B	Ridgeway North 40-ft	96.97	9.02	9.30%
C	Ridgeway South 40-ft	100.32	8.11	8.08%

Question 8: Does the site have farm investments?

Site	Alternative	total area	area of farm investments	% of the site that has farm investments
A	Modified Existing 40-ft	91.85	18.16	19.77%
B	Ridgeway North 40-ft	96.97	26.22	27.04%
C	Ridgeway South 40-ft	100.32	35.71	35.60%

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

DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INC.

December 10, 2003

Mr. Ray McPhail
US Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources and Conservation Service
Joliet Field Office
606 West Front Avenure
Joliet, MT 59041

SUBJECT: **BELFRY NORTH EA**
F STPP 72-1(1) 10 CN 1016 Control no. 1016
USDA NRCS-CPA-106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Forms

Dear Mr. McPhail:

Please find the enclosed USDA NRCS CPA-106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating forms for Corridor Type Projects and documentation containing supporting data prepared for the above referenced project. David Evans and Associates, Inc., project consultant, is managing the project for the Montana Department of Transportation.

We will be coordinating the identification of Important Farmlands and completion of the USDA NRCS CPA-106 forms through the Joliet Field Office, as directed in a July 1, 2002 correspondence from Dave White at the Bozeman Service Center.

The P-72 study area for the Environmental Assessment begins at the south end of the Town of Belfry at the P-72 and S-308 intersection (RP 10.54) and ends at the P-72 and US 310 intersection to the north (RP 21.42). For analysis purposes, the project has been divided into two segments. The Belfry Area segment (RP 10.54 – 12.73) has two build alignment alternatives. The Rural Corridor segment (RP 12.73 – 21.42) has three build alignment alternatives. In addition, each alternative has a 32ft width option and a 40ft width option which provides wider shoulders. The no-build alternative will have no impacts on important farmlands in either segment and as such is not included on either of the impact rating forms. The potential impact scores of the build alternatives for each segment have been filled into the impact rating forms as follows:

<u>Belfry Area - NRCS-CPA-106 Form #1 (Area Corresponds to Attached Map 1)</u>

Site A – Railroad Alignment – 32 ft width
Site B – Broadway Alignment – 32 ft width
Site C – Railroad Alignment - 40 ft width
Site D – Broadway Alignment – 40 ft width

1331 17th Street Suite 900 Denver Colorado 80202 Telephone: 720.946.0969 Facsimile: 720.946.0973

DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INC.

Rural Corridor – 32 ft Width NRCS-CPA-106 Form #2 (Area Corresponds to Attached Maps 2-5)

Site A – Modified Existing Alignment – 32 ft width
Site B – Ridgeway North Alignment – 32 ft width
Site C – Ridgeway South Alignment – 32 ft width

Rural Corridor – 40 ft Width - NRCS-CPA-106 Form #3 (Area Corresponds to Atttached Maps 2-5)

Site A – Modified Existing Alignment – 40 ft width
Site B – Ridgeway North Alignment – 40 ft width
Site C – Ridgeway South Alignment – 40 ft width

As per our phone conversation, I have provided hard copy documentation and hard copy maps for use in your review of this project. Below describes the contents of this transmittal.

Documentation	Description
NRCS-CPA-106 #1 (Belfry Segment)	NRCS-CPA-106 Form #1 for all Belfry Area segment alternatives, 32-ft width and 40-ft width.
Backup documentation #1 (Belfry Segment)	Spreadsheet with detailed percentages and calculations related NRCS-CPA-106 Section VI.
NRCS-CPA-106 #2 (Rural Segment, 32ft)	NRCS-CPA-106 Form #2 for Rural Corridor segment alternatives, **32ft-width** options.
Backup documentation #2 (Rural Segment, 32ft)	Spreadsheet with detailed percentages and calculations related NRCS-CPA-106 Section VI.
NRCS-CPA-106 #3 (Rural Segment, 40ft)	NRCS-CPA-106 Form #3 for Rural Corridor segment alternatives, **40ft-width** options.
Backup documentation #3 *(Rural Segment, 40ft)*	Spreadsheet with detailed percentages and calculations related NRCS-CPA-106 Section VI.
Maps #1-5 *(All Alternatives)*	1:450 scale maps of the project area and alternatives. To simplify the maps, only the 40-ft width for each alternative is shown. They are identical to the 32ft alternatives only with wider shoulders.

The documentation above is also available in digital format at your request. This includes spreadsheets and GIS data used in the conversion rating process.

1331 17th Street Suite 900 Denver Colorado 80202 Telephone: 720.946.0969 Facsimile: 720.946.0973

DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INC.

Please contact me at (720) 946-0969 if you have any questions about this information. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Richard J. Garcia
GIS Analyst/Planner

Copies: Tom Martin, MDT
Debra Perkins-Smith, DEA
File

Attachments/Enclosures: NRCS-CPA-106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects
Supporting documentation for calculations

File Name P:\MDOT0000-0013 Belfry North\ADMIN\Transmittals\nrcs_CPA-106_coverletter.doc