



Natural  
Resources  
Conservation  
Service

18410 Muncaster Road  
Derwood, MD 20855  
301-590-2855

---

March 2, 2001

Mr. Brian Bernstein  
Assistant Division Chief  
Environmental Planning Section  
KCI  
10 North Park Drive  
Hunt Valley, MD 21030-1846

Dear Mr. Bernstein:

Enclosed please find the completed AD-1006 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form for the MD 97 Brookeville Bypass Project. Thank you for providing the information that I requested. That information enabled me to complete the form AD-1006 in a more timely fashion.

If you have any questions, please call me at 301-590-2855.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. G. Warfield".

J. G. Warfield  
District Conservationist

JGW/bjb

The Natural Resources Conservation Service  
is an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1984-451 159/1324

U.S. Department of Agriculture

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING**

<b>PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>		Date Of Land Evaluation Request <b>February 15, 2001</b>			
Name Of Project <b>MD 97 Brookeville Bypass</b>		Federal Agency Involved <b>Federal Highway Administration</b>			
Proposed Land Use <b>Highway</b>		County And State <b>Montgomery County, Maryland</b>			
<b>PART II (To be completed by SCS)</b>		Date Request Received By SCS <b>2/21/01</b>			
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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Acres Irrigated <b>0</b>	Average Farm Size <b>157</b>	
Major Crops(s) <b>CORN SMALL GRAINS SOYBEANS HAY</b>	Farmable Land In Govt. Jurisdiction Acres: <b>167,100</b> % <b>52</b>	Amount Of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: <b>113,800</b> % <b>35</b>			
Name Of Land Evaluation System Used <b>MONTGOMERY COUNTY LAND EVALUATION ANALYSIS</b>	Name Of Local Site Assessment System <b>NONE</b>	Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS <b>3/2/01</b>			
<b>PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>		Alternative Site Rating			
		Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly		9.6/10.69	0.01/0.01	0.59/0.53	1.24/0.99
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
C. Total Acres In Site		58.30	58.51	58.51	58.51
<b>PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information</b>					
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland		24.19/23.21	4.47/4.25	4.90/4.75	4.64/4.33
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland		5.63/4.74	1.38/1.24	3.96/3.72	5.28/4.73
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted		0.0001	0.00004	0.00005	0.00006
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value		23.8	30.5	30.5	34.2
<b>PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion</b>					
Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points)		93.3	76.9	75.6	79.9
<b>PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>		Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(b))			
	Maximum Points	Alt. 5C	Alt. 7	Alt. 8A	Alt. 8B
1. Area In Nonurban Use	15	11	11	11	11
2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use	10	10	10	10	10
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed	20	20	20	20	20
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	15	20	20	20
5. Distance From Urban Builtup Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6. Distance To Urban Support Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	0	0	0	0
8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	5	0	0	0
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5	5	5	5
10. On-Farm Investments	20	2	0	0	0
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	0	0	0	0
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	7	2	2	2
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	75	68	68	68
<b>PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>					
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)		100			
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)		160			
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)		260			
Site Selected:		Date Of Selection	Was A Local Site Assessment Used? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Reason For Selection:					

**PRIME FARMLAND SOILS  
Montgomery County**

<b><u>Map Symbol</u></b>	<b><u>Soil Map Unit Name</u></b>
1B	Gaila silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
2A	Glenelg silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes
2B	Glenelg silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
4B	Elioak silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
17B	Occoquan loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
19A	Bucks silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes
19B	Bucks silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
20A	Brentsville sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes
20B	Brentsville sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
21A	Penn silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes
21B	Penn silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
25B	Legore silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
26B	Montalto silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
27B	Neshaminy silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
41A	Elsinboro silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes
41B	Elsinboro silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
43A	Elk silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
45A	Delanco silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
46A	Huntington silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
47A	Lindside silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
50A	Rowland silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
57B	Chillum silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
58B	Sassafras loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

**SOILS OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE**  
**Montgomery County**

<u>Map Symbol</u>	<u>Soil Map Unit Name</u>
1C	Gaila silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
2C	Glengel silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
4C	Elioak silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
9B	Linganore-Hyattstown complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes
9C	Linganore-Hyattstown complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes
16B	Brinklow-Blocktown complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes
16C	Brinklow-Blocktown complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes
17C	Occoquan channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
20A	Brentsville sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes
20B	Brentsville sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
21C	Penn silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
25C	Legore silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
26C	Montalto silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
27C	Neshaminy silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
29B	Jackland silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
37B	Travilah silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
45A	Delanco silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
48A	Melvin silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
51A	Bowmansville silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
57C	Chillum silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
59A	Beltsville silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes
59B	Beltsville silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
61B	Croom gravelly loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
61C	Croom gravelly loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes
64B	Croom and Bucks soils, 3 to 8 percent slopes
64C	Croom and Bucks soils, 8 to 15 percent slopes
65B	Wheaton silt loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FORM AD-1006  
RATIONALE FOR EVALUATION OF SIT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA  
7 CFR 658.5 (b)  
MARYLAND ROUTE 97-BROOKEVILLE, MARYLAND BYPASS  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND  
FEBRUARY 2001**

**1. How much land is in non-urban use within a radius of 1 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

Aerial photography and lane use maps were reviewed and a field review of the site was conducted to determine non-urban use within a 1-mile radius of the project area. It was estimated that 75 percent of the land area around the study area is in non-urban use. The town of Olney, located south of the study area, is the only urban area in the vicinity.

Rating: Alternative 5C-11 points; Alternative 7 – 11 points; Alternative 8A and B – 11 points

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

More than 90 percent – 10 points  
90 to 20 percent – 9 to 1 point(s)  
Less than 20 percent – 0 points

Aerial photography and lane use maps were reviewed and a field review of the site was conducted to determine the amount of non-urban land use bordering the project area. It was estimated that more than 80 percent of the land area bordering the perimeter of the site is in non-urban use.

Rating: Alternative 5C-10 points; Alternative 7 – 10 points; Alternatives 8A and B – 10 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

Aerial photographs were reviewed from previous years to evaluate changes in land use patterns. This review revealed that more than 90 percent of the farmland in the study area has been farmed more than five of the last ten years.

Rating: Alternative 5C-20 points; Alternative 7 – 20 points; Alternative 8A and 8B – 20 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 or covered by private programs to protected farmland?**

To preserve farmland and open space, the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission has adopted a Functional Master Plan for the Preservation of Agriculture and Rural Open Space (1980, updated 1988). The plan recommends techniques to protect and preserve farmland and rural open space. The study area is located within two agricultural protection areas of the county. The study area west of existing MD 97 is within the Rural Density Transfer Zone or “RDT” zone. One dwelling unit is permitted per 25 acres of

farmland. The study area east of existing MD 97 is located within the Rural Cluster (RC) Zone. In this zone, overall density is one dwelling unit per five acres with a cluster option for one-acre minimum lot sizes. For example, if the base zone is one dwelling unit per five acres and the tract is 100 acres in size, the number of permitted dwelling units is 20. The cluster option would allow these 20 units to be grouped on lots as small as one acre on approximately 40 percent of the parcel or 40 acres. The remainder of the tract (60 percent or 60 acres) could be preserved as open space or used for agricultural uses.

Rating: Alternative 5C-15 points; Alternative 7 – 20 points; Alternative 8A and 8B – 20 points

**5. Criterion 5 is not considered applicable for corridor-type projects.**

**6. Criterion 6 is not considered applicable for corridor-type projects.**

**7. Is the farm unit(s) containing the site (before the project) as large as the average-size farming unit in the country?**

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 point(s)

According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service in Montgomery County, the average size of a farm in the county is 157 acres. All four Alternatives impact one farmland parcel. The size of each farmland parcel affected by these alternatives is less than 50 percent of the average farm size in the county.

Rating: Alternative 5C – 0 points; Alternative 7 – 0 points; Alternatives 8A and 8B – 0 points

**8. If this site is chosen for the project, how much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of the 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 – 24 to 1 point(s)

Acreage equal to less than 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project – 0 points

Only Alternative 5C will bisect farmland. Alternatives 7, 8A and 8B will only affect the edge of the existing farm field. Because the proposed roadway improvements will be two-lane undivided roadways with shoulders, access to the remaining farmland is not anticipated to be a problem.

Rating: Alternative 5C – 5 points; Alternative 7 – 0 points; Alternatives 8A and 8B – 0 points

**9. Does the site have available adequate supply of farm support services and markets, i.e. farm suppliers, equipment dealers, processing and storage facilities and farmers markets?**

All required services are available – 5 points

Some required services are available – 4 to 1 point(s)

No required services are available – 0 point(s)

All required services are available to the farms in the area for each alternative. According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service in Montgomery County, agricultural services are located outside of the study area in Frederick, Howard and Montgomery Counties.

Rating: Alternative 5C – 5 points; Alternative 7 – 5 points; Alternatives 8A and 8B – 5 points

**10. Does the site have substantial and well maintained and on-farm investments such as barns, other storage buildings, farm trees and vines, field terraces, drainage, irrigation waterways or other soil and water conservation measures?**

High amount of on-farm investments – 20 points  
Moderate amount of on-farm investment – 19 to 1 point(s)  
No on-farm investment – 0 point

A minimal amount of on-farm investments was noticed during a field visit to the study area. No structures related to farming activity would be required by any of the proposed build alternatives.

Rating: Alternative 5C – 2 points; Alternative 7 – 0 points; Alternatives 8A and 8B – 0 points

**11. Would the project at this site, by converting farmland to non-agricultural 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 – 24 to 1 point(s)  
No significant reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted – 0 points

None of the proposed build alternatives are anticipated to reduce the demand for farmland support services in the area. The 10.69 acres of active farmland impacts associated with Alternative 5C is the maximum amount of active farmland impacts generated by any of the proposed build alternatives. The other three alternatives affect less than 1.25 acres. The viability of the study area for farming activity should not be jeopardized by the proposed roadway improvements.

Rating: Alternative 5C – 0 point(s); Alternative 7 – 0 point(s); Alternatives 8A and 8B – 0 point(s)

**12. 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 non-agricultural use?**

Proposed project is incompatible with 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 point(s)

The purpose of the proposed roadway improvements is to remove the increasing volumes of traffic from the town of Brookeville, improve traffic operations and safety on existing MD 97 and preserve the historic character of Brookeville. The zoning classifications of land in the study area (see item 4) are in place to preserve agricultural activity and provide developers the opportunity to cluster their developments on agriculturally zoned land.

Rating: Alternative 5C – 7 points; Alternative 7 – 2 points; Alternatives 8A and 8B – 2 points

Total Rating:     Alternative 5C – 75 points  
                          Alternative 7 – 68 points  
                          Alternative 8A – 68 points  
                          Alternative 8B – 68 point