# **APPENDIX G**

## FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FORMS

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 11/7/05 4. Sheet 1 of 1					
1. Name of Project Greenville Southwest Bypass		5. Fede	5. Federal Agency Involved				
2. Type of Project New Location Freeway		Federal Highway Administration           6. County and State         Pitt County, NC					
<ul> <li>PART II (To be completed by NF</li> <li>Does the corrider contain prime, unit (If no, the EPPA does not apply D)</li> <li>Major Crop(s)</li> <li>Major Crop(s)</li> <li>COR M</li> <li>Name Of Land, Evaluation System I, P : H</li> <li>D</li> <li>PART III (To be completed by Fe</li> <li>A. Total Acres To Be Converted Dire</li> <li>B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indi</li> <li>C. Total Acres In Corridor</li> <li>PART IV (To be completed by N</li> <li>A. Total Acres Prime Arid Unique F</li> </ul>	RCS) que statewide or local important familar a not complete additional parts of this for 6. Farmable L Acres: 2 Jsed 9. Name of Lo Acres: 2 Jsed 9. Name of Lo Acres: 2 Jsed 9. Name of Lo Acres: 2 Acres: 2	6. Cour 1. Date 1.	Ity and State     Pitt       Request Received by     15     0       15     0     5       YES     M     NO       Inment Jurisdiction     4     1       34     4     1       sament System     5	County, NC NRCS 2 Person J OKA 4 Acres 1 7 Amount Acres 10 Date L	C GATER Ingaled Average I 2 01 Familand As De 3:5 G HOLE and Evaluation Ret 7:5 - 10:5	arm Size 2-19 Juned in FPPA wined by NRCS 2-242 Gerridune	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt Unit To Be Convert D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jutisdiction With Same Or Higher Rela PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information Criterio Value of Farmland to Be Serviced or Converted (Scale of 0- 100 Points PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))		ative Value on Relative s) Maximum	139 0.43 84.9 57.5	1201 162 0.37 84.9 56.4	1128 159 8.36 34.9 53.2		
1. Area in Nonurban Use		15	11				
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use		10	G	12			
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed		20	14		<u> </u>		
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government		20	14	14	14	<u>ئ</u>	
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average		10	<u> </u>	0	0		
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland		25		7	7		
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services		<u>25</u> 5	0	<u> </u>	6	``	
8. On-Farm Investments		20	10		14	-	
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services		25			17		
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use		10			<u>}</u>		
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS			NM	8			
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)		160	0	0 79	077	.0	
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)							
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part V)		100					
		160	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above	e 2 lines)	260	0	0	0	0	
1. Corridor Selected:	<ol> <li>Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:</li> </ol>	3. Date Of S	Of Selection: 4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used?				
5. Reason For Selection:			YES NO				
Signature of Person Completing this Part:							
		•					
NOTE: Complete a form for ea	ach segment with more than or	e Alternat	e Corridor				
NOTE: Complete a form for each segment with more than one Alternate Corridor							

#### NRCS-CPA-106 (Reverse)

### **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