

Chapter 4: Farmland

4.1	Introduction	4-2
4.2	Regulatory Setting	4-2
4.2.1	Farmland Protection Policy Act	4-2
4.2.2	Utah Farmland Assessment Act	4-4
4.2.3	Agriculture Protection Areas	4-5
4.2.4	Century Farms	4-6
4.3	Affected Environment	4-7
4.3.1	Overview of Local Farmland Conditions	4-7
4.3.2	Involvement of the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food, Local Farmers, and Other Agriculture Experts in the WDC Project	4-8
4.3.3	Resource Identification Methods	4-9
4.3.4	Cropland	4-11
4.3.5	FPPA-Regulated Farmland	4-12
4.3.6	Agriculture Protection Areas	4-13
4.3.7	Century Farms	4-14
4.4	Environmental Consequences	4-17
4.4.1	Methodology	4-17
4.4.2	No-Action Alternative	4-21
4.4.3	Alternatives A1–A2	4-22
4.4.4	Alternatives B1–B2	4-29
4.4.5	Wetland Avoidance Options	4-34
4.4.6	Mitigation Measures	4-35
4.4.7	Cumulative Impacts	4-37
4.4.8	Summary of Impacts	4-38
4.5	References	4-39

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses general farmland trends and crops in the farmland impact analysis area as well as specially classified farmland (prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide or local importance), Agriculture Protection Areas, and Century Farms. This chapter also examines the effects of the West Davis Corridor (WDC) alternatives on farmland. The economic impacts to the agricultural economy and farm businesses are addressed in Chapter 8, Economics. The purpose of studying impacts to farmland is to determine whether the WDC would contribute to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

The farmland impact analysis area is rich in agricultural history. However, as the area has developed, agricultural land has been converted to non-agricultural uses at a rapid pace. As part of the WDC Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, scoping meetings were held with the public and resource agencies to help identify issues to be analyzed in this EIS. The comments received during the public and agency scoping period were reviewed to determine whether any significant issues were identified. The public identified the loss of farmlands as a major concern. The scoping comments can be reviewed in the project's *Scoping Summary Report* (West Davis Corridor Team 2010).

Farmland Impact Analysis Area. The farmland impact analysis area, which is the same as the WDC study area (see Figure 1-1, West Davis Corridor Needs Assessment Study Area, in Volume IV), is located in Davis and Weber Counties and crosses the cities of Clinton, Farmington, Hooper, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, and West Point. This impact analysis area was selected because the farmland in this area could be affected by the project alternatives.

What is the farmland impact analysis area?

The farmland impact analysis area, which is the same as the WDC study area, is located in Davis and Weber Counties and crosses the cities of Clinton, Farmington, Hooper, Kaysville, Layton, Syracuse, and West Point.

What is scoping?

Scoping is an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action.

4.2 Regulatory Setting

4.2.1 Farmland Protection Policy Act

The National Agricultural Land Study of 1980–1981 found that millions of acres of farmland were being converted in the United States each year. The 1981 congressional report *Compact Cities: Energy-Saving Strategies for the Eighties* identified the need for Congress to implement programs and policies to protect farmland and combat urban sprawl and the waste of energy and resources that accompanies sprawling development.

The Compact Cities report found that much of the sprawl was the result of programs funded by the federal government. With this in mind, the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) of 1981 was enacted to “minimize the extent to which federal programs contribute to the

unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses” [7 United States Code (USC) 4201(b)]. The FPPA also stipulates that federal programs must be compatible with state, local, and private efforts to protect farmland.

The FPPA is intended to minimize the extent to which federal activities contribute to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The FPPA requires federal agencies to examine the impact of their programs before they approve any activity that would convert farmland to a non-agricultural use.

For the purpose of the FPPA, farmland includes prime farmland (which has prime soil characteristics), unique farmland (which is suited for high-value specialty crops), and farmland of statewide or local importance. Farmland subject to FPPA requirements does not have to be currently used for cropland. It can be forest land, pasture land, cropland, or other land, but not water or urban built-up land (that is, farmland within city limits).

If a federal project is located outside incorporated city limits on land that is currently farmed or on land that could be farmed, then the federal agency leading the project is required to determine whether prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance is present. For the WDC Project, this agency is the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

- **Prime farmland** is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and is available for these uses. The land must have the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed (including water management) according to acceptable farming methods (Utah Agricultural Experiment Station 1983).
- **Unique farmland** is land “other than prime farmland that is used for production of specific high-value food and fiber crops,” as determined by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture. Examples of such crops are citrus, tree nuts, olives, cranberries, and vegetables (Speth 1980). There is no unique farmland in the impact analysis area.
- **Farmland of statewide or local importance** is farmland, other than prime or unique farmland, that is of statewide or local importance for the production of agricultural crops.
 - **Farmland of statewide importance** has the soil, water supply, and other characteristics that, with good management, productively yield crops (Utah Agricultural Experiment Station 1983).
 - **Farmland of local importance** is farmland other than prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance that is either currently producing crops or has the capability to produce crops. This land can be important to the local economy due to its productivity. It does not include publicly owned land for which there is an adopted policy preventing agricultural use (NRCS 2003).

As used in the FPPA, the term *farmland* does not include land already in or committed to urban development (within city limits) or water storage [7 USC 4201(c)(1)].



For projects such as the WDC, the FPPA requires that each corridor under study (that is, the route of each proposed alternative) be evaluated to determine the impacts from the proposed project and the resulting conversion of identified prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance.

The federal agency responsible for overseeing compliance with the FPPA is the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). NRCS does not make determinations on possible prime and unique farmland and farmland of statewide or local importance that is already committed to development within city limits. NRCS's position is that, when funds have already been committed for utilities, water lines, and road replacement and widening, the land is committed to development and can be exempt from a determination.

For actions outside city limits that could affect farmland, the FPPA requires federal agencies to prepare a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form, which is known as Form NRCS-CPA-106 for corridor-type projects, and to submit the form to NRCS. NRCS uses this information to evaluate whether there are farmlands subject to the FPPA requiring protection in the project area. Corridors that receive a total score of less than 160 points on the CPA-106 form do not need to be given further consideration for protection, and no additional corridors need to be evaluated.

Appendix 4B, Farmland Correspondence, includes a copy of the NRCS guidance letter that suspends the requirement to make determinations on farmland that is already committed to development through local actions (NRCS 1999). Appendix 4B also includes a record of correspondence with the local Salt Lake City NRCS office stating that this guidance is still in effect (Albers 2017). The FPPA also states that land already committed to development is not considered farmland (7 CFR 658). Appendix 4A, Farmland Impact Rating Form, includes completed Forms NRCS-CPA-106 and supporting data for all of the WDC action alternatives.

4.2.2 Utah Farmland Assessment Act

Prior to 1969, Utah farmland was assessed and taxed according to its market value. However, as urban areas began to expand into the surrounding agricultural properties, the market value of agricultural property began to rise. This increased market value led to property taxes that made some farming operations economically prohibitive. In 1969, the Utah legislature passed the Utah Farmland Assessment Act (UFAA, also called the Greenbelt law), which allowed qualified agricultural property to be assessed and taxed on its productive capability instead of its market value. Although the UFAA is not a federal requirement, it is considered in this section because the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT; a state agency) is involved in the WDC Project.

Land eligible for the UFAA is classified according to its capability of producing crops or forage. Capability depends on soil type, topography, availability of irrigation water, growing season, and other factors. The County Assessor classifies all agricultural land in a county based on NRCS soil surveys and guidelines provided by the local tax commission. The general classifications of agricultural land are irrigated, dryland, grazing land, orchard, and meadow. Private farmland can qualify for assessment and taxation under the UFAA if the

land is at least 5 contiguous acres. For the purpose of the UFAA, property is considered contiguous even if it is bisected by a public highway, unimproved road, fence, canal, waterway, property line, or county border as long as both parcels have identical legal ownership.

4.2.3 Agriculture Protection Areas

One of the purposes of Utah’s zoning laws is to support the state’s agriculture. Zoning is established by a commission for each county or city that adopts a plan for zoning all land within the county or city. Utah law also allows the formation of Agriculture Protection Areas (APAs), which are geographic areas where agricultural activities are given special protections. State codes require that any property being placed under agricultural protection must be a minimum of 5 contiguous acres, and the landowner making the request must be using the property as farmland.

What are Agriculture Protection Areas (APAs)?

APAs are geographic areas where agricultural activities are given special protections.

APAs are not federally regulated, but they are protected from state and local laws that would restrict farm practices, unless the laws are required for public safety or are required by federal law. The county or city in which the APA is located cannot change the zoning designation of the land within the APA unless all landowners give written approval for the change.

APAs cannot be condemned for highway purposes unless (1) the landowner requests the removal of the designation or (2) the applicable legislative body (that is, the legislative body of the county, city, or town in which the APA is located) and the APA advisory board approve the condemnation, provided that “there is no reasonable and prudent alternative to the use of the land within the Agriculture Protection Area for the project” [Utah Administrative Code, Section 17-41-405(4)(a)]. Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 41, does not define a standard for “reasonable and prudent.” If a highway is built adjacent to an APA and protected agricultural areas remain in agricultural use, farm equipment access must be provided to allow landowners to move farm machinery between parcels.

In addition, as stated in Utah Administrative Code Section 17-41-406, each state agency that plans any development project that might affect land within an APA shall submit its development plan to the advisory board of the APA and the Commissioner of Agriculture and Food. The Commissioner of Agriculture and Food and the advisory board shall:

- Review the state agency’s proposed development plan.
- Recommend any modifications to the development project that would protect the integrity of the APA or that would protect the APA from nonfarm encroachment.

Further, each state agency and political subdivision of the state that designates or proposes to designate a transportation corridor shall:

- Consider whether the transportation corridor would be located on land that is included within an APA or would interfere with agriculture production activities on land within an APA.
- Consider each other reasonably comparable alternative to the placement of the corridor on land within an APA.
- Make reasonable efforts to minimize or eliminate any detrimental impact on agriculture that may result from the designation of a transportation corridor.

4.2.4 Century Farms

As part of the Utah State Centennial celebration in 1996, the Century Farm and Ranch program was initiated to honor Utah farms and ranches that have been operated continuously by the same family for at least 100 years. The program had two main objectives: the first was to honor farm and ranch families, and the second was to increase public awareness of the contribution of agriculture to the state. The Century Farm and Ranch designation was intended to highlight the commitment of Utah farm and ranch families to the state's agricultural industry.

Owners of these farms apply to have their property identified as a Century Farm or Ranch. These farms receive the Century Farm and Ranch designation from the Utah Farm Bureau Federation and the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food. These operations are typically the few remaining long-term farming operations along the Wasatch Front.

The Century Farm and Ranch application form asks for items such as historical farm/ranch name, applicant's name and address, farm/ranch description, and lineal descent of farm/ranch ownership. Lineal descent must be traced through a son, daughter, grandson, or granddaughter, including in-laws, of the previous owner. The farm must meet the definition of a farm as set forth in the Utah Farmland Assessment Act (5 acres or more used for agricultural operations).

What are Century Farms?

A Century Farm has been operated continuously by the same family for at least 100 years.

4.3 Affected Environment

4.3.1 Overview of Local Farmland Conditions

The Wasatch Front has had substantial population growth over the last four decades, and much of this growth has come at the expense of agriculture. Between 1974 and 2002, Weber County lost 109,200 acres of farmland, and Davis County lost 71,200 acres of farmland. This trend continued in Davis County, which lost about another 16,600 farm acres between 2002 and 2007.

However, during the economic recession between 2007 and 2012, the amount of farmland in Davis County increased by about 5,700 acres as residential development slowed and open land was leased to farmers to generate income. Between 2002 and 2007, Weber County gained about 19,300 farm acres and between 2007 and 2012 gained another 11,100 acres (Downen 2009; USDA 2007, 2014). After 2012 residential development has increased and available land is being converted to residential uses. Chapter 8, Economics, includes more detailed information regarding the value of agriculture to the economy.

The information for Davis and Weber Counties is from the 2007 and 2012 Censuses of Agriculture (USDA 2007, 2014). The Census of Agriculture is updated every 5 years.

4.3.1.1 Davis County

According to the 2012 Census of Agriculture (USDA 2014), the acreage of land in farms in Davis County increased by 12% between 2007 and 2012 (from 49,279 acres in 2007 to 55,017 in 2012). The average farm size in the county increased about 13% between 2007 (99 acres) and 2012 (112 acres). With a total acreage of 191,200 acres, Davis County is the smallest of the four counties along the Wasatch Front (Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties), and the county has a relatively high population density with 1.55 persons per acre. This makes it difficult for the county to accommodate both population growth and expanding agriculture. Given this trend, many tracts of land that are currently in or zoned for agricultural use are shown as future residential areas in city and county land-use plans. The growth in the amount of farmland in production between 2007 and 2012 is likely the result of farmers cultivating previously fallow fields in response to better prices for agricultural products in 2012 versus 2007 and the slow growth in residential subdivisions during the economic recession between 2008 and 2012.

In Davis County, agricultural activity has shifted from primarily livestock, poultry, and their associated products to crops. In 1974, livestock and poultry accounted for more than two-thirds of the total value of agricultural products sold in Davis County, with the remainder coming from crops. By 2012, livestock and poultry provided just 14% of agricultural sales, with crops accounting for 86%. Because of the long growing season, productive soils, and high amount of precipitation relative to the rest of the counties in Utah, Davis County has the highest cash receipts for crops per acre (\$2,638) of the 29 counties in Utah.

4.3.1.2 Weber County

According to the 2012 Census of Agriculture (USDA 2014), the acreage of land in farms in Weber County increased 11% between 2007 and 2012 (from 106,247 acres in 2007 to 117,415 acres in 2012). The average farm size in the county stayed relatively stable with 106 acres in 2007 and 105 acres in 2012, a decrease of about 1%. Weber County has 368,100 acres and was able to increase both its population and its farmland because of its low population density of 0.6 person per acre in 2007 (Downen 2009). It's reasonable to assume that the availability of open, non-developed farmable land in Weber County contributed to the addition of cultivated farmland during this period.

Although crops have increased their share of total agricultural sales in Weber County, livestock and poultry remain the major sources of farm sales. In 1974, livestock and poultry accounted for nearly 90% of the value of farm sales; in 2012, they accounted for 58% of farm sales. According to the 2012 Census of Agriculture, the top five crop items in Weber County were forage (typically alfalfa for grazing, hay, or silage), corn for silage, wheat for grain, winter wheat for grain, and vegetables harvested for sale. Of the 29 counties in Utah, Weber County ranks seventh in cash receipts of crops per acre at \$605.

4.3.2 Involvement of the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food, Local Farmers, and Other Agriculture Experts in the WDC Project

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food. The Commissioner of the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food (UDAF) has been actively engaged in the WDC Project. In April 2011, officials from UDAF led transportation officials on an agriculture-oriented tour of the proposed WDC alignments. The tour took officials through three Davis County farms that would be affected by UDOT's various alignments for the highway. The tour also went through the Bay View Duck Club property to observe the integration of agriculture, wetlands, and wildlife. The farms on the tour were Black Island Farms, Hamblin Dairy, and Utah Onions. The Commissioner said that "a road through prime farmland could have a devastating effect on the farming community." UDAF provided UDOT with information specific to several individual farms that are considered important to the farming community and the public at large.

Local Farmers. Several of the farmers in the impact analysis area have also been actively engaged in the WDC Project. The farmers believe that the agricultural sustainability of the local fresh-vegetable market will be at risk if the WDC is built through farmland.

The farmers believe that the value of agricultural production is an important resource in Davis and Weber Counties. UDOT's analysis of soil quality and the microclimate in the impact analysis area validates the farmers' claims that, without the proper soil and climate, certain produce (such as onions) probably could not be farmed at the same level it is today. Several farmers provided UDOT with information specific to their individual farms.

State and National Agriculture Experts. Agriculture experts from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the University of Utah, the National Association of Conservation

Districts, and the Utah Association of Conservation Districts maintain that several factors make the agricultural climate in the impact analysis area unique compared to other counties in Utah. These factors include the fact that the area’s irrigation and water supply infrastructure is in place and operates efficiently. Many other agricultural areas in Utah do not have the infrastructure in place that is necessary for farming. Past investment—such as irrigation and drainage—made by the federal government in Davis and Weber Counties is a large reason that the infrastructure is in place.

In addition, the experts said that the impact analysis area is located near a major market, and this location reduces transportation costs and allows more opportunities to distribute farm products. Crops can be sold to local stores, through community-supported agriculture (CSA), at roadside stands, and at farmers’ markets. With such a large population base nearby, all of these methods make farming more profitable for local farmers. The experts echoed the farmers’ assertion that a greater number of growing days and the temperate climate created by the Great Salt Lake help the farms in the impact analysis area produce higher yields per acre than farms in other counties in Utah (HDR 2012).

4.3.3 Resource Identification Methods

The WDC team obtained information about farmland using the following methods:

- Reviewing USDA’s online Census of Agriculture from 2002, 2007, and 2012, and the Utah State Water Plan published by the Utah Division of Water Resources
- Reviewing the Utah Division of Water Resources’ Water-Related Land Use Data Inventory map dated 2013, as well as reviewing city and county websites
- Reviewing NRCS soils data
- Meeting or corresponding with local officials with jurisdiction over the farmland resource
- Meeting with agriculture experts from USDA, the University of Utah, the National Association of Conservation Districts, and the Utah Association of Conservation Districts
- Meeting, taking site tours, and corresponding with local farmers in Davis and Weber Counties
- Reviewing public comments
- Reviewing city and county maps
- Conducting field reviews

What is the WDC team?

The WDC team consists of the lead agencies for the WDC Project (FHWA and UDOT).

All identified croplands, prime farmland, farmland of statewide or local importance, APAs, and Century Farms were added to a data layer in an electronic map file. Table 4-1 below describes the farmland resources in the impact analysis area.



Table 4-1. Farmland Resources in the Farmland Impact Analysis Area

Farmland Resource	Characteristics
Cropland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cropland generally is land under cultivation but also includes pasture and fallow land. • Cropland can be irrigated or dryland (non-irrigated). • Cropland can be identified through a number of programs or methods. Cropland data are compiled by federal, state, and local governments. • No specific protection unless land is also prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide or local importance, or an APA.
Prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide or local importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are important farmlands as identified under the federal FPPA (see Section 4.2.1, Farmland Protection Policy Act). • The program is overseen by NRCS. • Federal actions that could affect prime and unique farmland must have a FPPA evaluation. The evaluation is initiated by preparing a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form. • The Farmland Conversion Impact Rating is incorporated into the environmental document for the proposed project. Corridors that receive a total score of less than 160 points on the CPA-106 form do not need to be given further consideration for protection, and no additional corridors need to be evaluated. • State and local governments work together to identify farmland of statewide or local importance. • Designations and protections apply only to farmland outside city limits.
Agriculture Protection Areas (APAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These areas are lands devoted to agricultural use and identified as APAs according to an Agriculture Protection Area Advisory Board established by each county. • Counties record (enroll), assess, and evaluate lands protected under the Utah Farmland Assessment Act. Taxes on APAs are assessed based on the enrolled lands' productive value. • Creation of APAs does not impair the ability of land within the area to obtain the benefits of Title 59, Chapter 2, Part 5, of the Utah Farmland Assessment Act (Greenbelt law). • APAs are protected from regulations that would restrict farm practices, unless the regulations are required for public safety or are required by federal law. • Landowners choose to enroll in and withdraw from the program.
Century Farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary program through which designation is initiated by the farm owner and granted by the Utah Farm Bureau Federation and UDAF. • Long-term, family-based farming operations. • No specific protection unless land is also prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide or local importance, or an APA.

4.3.4 Cropland

Farmland in the impact analysis area is used for cultivation (cropland), livestock grazing, and dry pasture, although some land traditionally used for agriculture is fallow. Fallow farmland is typically plowed but is left unseeded during the growing season. For the most part, active agricultural production in the impact analysis area focuses on irrigated crops (such as alfalfa, corn, and grain) and pasture land. Alfalfa accounts for the largest acreage of an irrigated crop grown in the impact analysis area (5,237 acres), and about 10% of the alfalfa grown in the impact analysis area is grown on farmland that qualifies as prime farmland according to the FPPA guidelines.

About 328 acres of the 2,317 acres of corn grown in the impact analysis area are grown on prime farmland, while 60 acres of the 582 acres of onions in the impact analysis area are grown on prime farmland. Because most of these crops are grown on land that is not identified as prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance, it's reasonable to assume that they are grown within municipal boundaries (that is, in areas where the designations of prime and unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance are not applied). Crops are frequently rotated; therefore, while these data provide an accurate picture of crop distribution in the impact analysis area, they might not reflect the most current crop pattern.

According to UDAF, the canal systems in Davis and Weber Counties provide irrigation water necessary for crop production. Most farmers in the impact analysis area rely on the water from these systems for crop production. Flood irrigation is currently used as the major method of water delivery. The two main water-distribution systems used in western Davis and Weber Counties are the Layton Canal and the Hooper Canal. Chapter 13, Water Quality, describes the impacts to non-drinking water points of diversion. Chapter 5, Community Impacts, describes impacts to the canals in the sections that describe impacts to public services and utilities.

A large portion of irrigated and sub-irrigated farmland is currently used as pasture (about 9,141 acres, or 45%). A large amount of farmland that could be irrigated is currently idle and is therefore not irrigated and not being farmed (2,356 acres, or 77% of the non-irrigated farmland). Idle land is land that is not put to a qualified farm use as a result of a management decision (Illinois Department of Revenue 2012).

About 10% of the irrigated pasture (563 of 5,583 acres) in the impact analysis area is considered prime farmland. Of the 2,356 acres of idle irrigated land in the impact analysis area, none is considered prime farmland, and 11 acres are considered farmland of statewide importance.

What is sub-irrigated farmland?

Sub-irrigated farmland is farmland that is irrigated either by an underground system of pipes or by natural moisture in the subsoil rather than by aboveground, sprinkler-type irrigation.

Table 4-2 provides an overview of the irrigated and non-irrigated crops and farmland in the impact analysis area. These crops and farmland are shown in Figures 4-3 and 4-4, Croplands, in Volume IV.

Table 4-2. Crops and Farmland in the Farmland Impact Analysis Area

Crop or Farmland Type	Acres	Crop or Farmland Type	Acres
<i>Irrigated</i>		<i>Non-irrigated</i>	
Alfalfa	5,237	Dry alfalfa/grain/seeds	49
Beans	148	Dry idle	238
Berries	15	Dry pasture	323
Corn	2,317	Fallow – irrigated land	89
Onions	582	Idle – irrigated land	2,356
Potatoes/tomatoes	9	Total non-irrigated	3,055
Grain	1,782		
Grass/hay	472		
Orchard	20		
Other horticulture	215		
Other vegetables	216		
Pasture	5,583		
Pasture – sub-irrigated	3,558		
Sorghum	8		
Turf farms	118		
Total irrigated	20,280		
Total irrigated and non-irrigated acres		23,335	

Source: Utah Division of Water Resources 2013

4.3.5 FPPA-Regulated Farmland

4.3.5.1 Prime and Unique Farmland

Table 4-3 shows that the impact analysis area contains about 2,487 acres of prime farmland. Figures 4-1 and 4-2, FPPA-Regulated Farmland, in Volume IV show the prime farmland as designated by NRCS in the impact analysis area. NRCS distinguishes between two types of prime farmland: “prime when irrigated” and “prime when irrigated and drained.” According to NRCS, both types of prime farmland are present in the impact analysis area. There is no unique farmland in the impact analysis area.

The FPPA considers land that is within city limits to be “committed to other uses,” and such land needs no further evaluation under the FPPA. It’s important to remember

What are prime farmland and unique farmland?

Prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and is available for these uses.

Unique farmland is land other than prime farmland used for the production of specific high-value food and fiber crops.

that much of the farmland in the impact analysis area is located within incorporated municipal boundaries. Although some farmland in the incorporated area of the impact analysis area could qualify as prime or unique under the definitions above, any such farmland was not considered in this analysis since the FPPA applies only to land outside city limits. The farmland within city limits that is not regulated by the FPPA is analyzed in this EIS in Section 4.3.4, Cropland.

Table 4-3. FPPA-Regulated Farmland in the Farmland Impact Analysis Area^a

Farmland Designation	Acres
Prime farmland	2,443
Unique farmland	0
Farmland of statewide or local importance	44
Total	2,487

Sources: Utah Division of Water Resources 2013; NRCS 2010

^a FPPA-regulated farmland applies only outside city limits.

4.3.5.2 Farmland of Statewide Importance

Based on consultation with NRCS (2010) and as shown in Table 4-3 above, the impact analysis area contains about 44 acres of farmland of statewide importance. Figures 4-1 and 4-2, FPPA-Regulated Farmland, in Volume IV show farmland of statewide importance in the impact analysis area as designated by NRCS. As noted in Section 4.3.4, Cropland, the FPPA considers land that is within city limits to be “committed to other uses,” and such land needs no further evaluation under the FPPA.

Although some additional farmland in the incorporated area of the impact analysis area could qualify as farmland of statewide importance under the definition above, any such farmland was not considered in this analysis.

What is farmland of statewide importance?

Farmland of statewide importance is farmland of lesser quality than prime or unique farmland that has the soil, water supply, and other characteristics that, with good management, yield productive crops.

4.3.6 Agriculture Protection Areas

There are 114 individual parcels with APA status in the impact analysis area. These APAs, which are mostly used to raise crops, have received special zoning protection from the local county jurisdictions to preserve the area as open space related to agriculture.

The 114 APA parcels contain about 1,989 acres of mostly irrigated farmland. The APAs are located in both the Davis and Weber County parts of the impact analysis area. Several of the APAs are located in unincorporated parts of Davis County, West Point, Syracuse, and

Clinton. However, most of the APAs in the impact analysis area are located in Hooper. Appendix 4C, Agriculture Protection Areas, lists the APAs by parcel ID number (from county records) and lists the acres included in each APA as well as the city in which it is located (unless it is in an unincorporated area, in which case it is listed by county). Figures 4-5 and 4-6, Agriculture Protection Areas (APAs), in Volume IV show the locations of the APAs.

4.3.7 Century Farms

According to UDAF and the Utah Farm Bureau Federation, there are 47 Century Farms in the impact analysis area (UDAF 2012). Table 4-4 lists the farm names and cities in which they are located. Figures 4-7 and 4-8, Century Farms, in Volume IV show the locations of the Century Farms.

Table 4-4. Century Farms in the Farmland Impact Analysis Area

Farm	City	Farm	City
Allen Farm	Hooper	Green Farms	Layton
Cox Farm	Hooper	J & J Produce	Layton
Dale O Christensen Farm	Hooper	James W Day Farm	Layton
Fowers Dairy Farm	Hooper	Jesse & Ellen Stevenson Farm	Layton
Fowers Farm	Hooper	Layton Farms	Layton
H L Parker Farms	Hooper	Page Farm	Layton
Parker-Jones Farm	Hooper	Robert Call & Sons	Layton
Penman Farm	Hooper	Levi Roberts Farms	Layton
Preston Fowers Farm	Hooper	Roberts Farms	Layton
Richard Widdison O Farm	Hooper	Stevenson Farms	Layton
Ronald Fowers Farm	Hooper	W & C Flint Cattle Breeders	Layton
Smith Farm	Hooper	Phil Green Dairy Farm	Hooper
Spaulding Family Trust Farm	Hooper	Briggs Farm	Syracuse
Triple F Farm	Hooper	Briggs Dairy	Syracuse
Hill Brothers	Kaysville	Christensen Farm	Syracuse
Hyde Family Farm	Kaysville	Cook Farm	Syracuse
Robins Farm	Kaysville	Hamblin Dairy	Syracuse
Wilford Smith Family Farms & Coop	Kaysville	Leo Layton Warren Estate	Syracuse
Call Farms	Layton	Lyle Johnston Farm	West Point
Dan & Ann Layton Farm	Layton	Bennett Family Farm	West Point
Dean Egbert Angus	Layton	Johnston Farm	West Point
Evans Family Farm	Layton	Manning Farm	West Point
George Vickers Stevenson Farm	Layton	Stoddard Ranch	West Point

Sources: Olsen 2011; UDAF 2012; Utah Farm Bureau Federation 2014

4.3.7.1 Century Farm Particulars

UDAF, or in some cases individual farmers, provided UDOT with information for a few particular Century Farms, which are described below. UDOT was not able to obtain information for all of the Century Farms listed in Table 4-4 above; however, the snapshot

given for the few Century Farms below is representative of the Century Farms in the impact analysis area.

Cook Farm

The Cook Farm is a Century Farm located in Syracuse on 3000 West between 1700 South and 2700 South. According to its owners, the farm is irrigated and is divided into five pieces. The sandy loam soil, availability of water, and climate in western Davis County combine to make the farm perfect for growing vegetables, alfalfa, wheat, and other crops. The farm produces wheat at over 130 bushels per acre. According to the Cook family, these conditions can't be duplicated elsewhere in Davis County due to limitations in available farm ground, water, and water-delivery systems.

The farm is currently leased by Mountain Country Produce, one of the largest sweet corn and vegetable producers in Utah. In 2011, the farm produced over 13,000 boxes of sweet corn and about 250 tons of pumpkins. Vegetables were sold to local grocery stores, and over 175 tons of hay were baled for winter feed. About 100 to 125 head of beef cattle and calves pasture on the farm in the summer and are fed on the farm in the winter. In addition, 23 gallons of honey were harvested from the farm's beehives.

Hamblin Dairy

With its 230 cows, Hamblin Dairy, at 3454 West 2700 South in Syracuse, is the last operating dairy farm in Davis County. The farm has been in operation for over 100 years, and the current owner is the fourth-generation owner. Thousands of Utah school children visit the dairy each year. Each day, 1,000 gallons of milk are taken from the farm's 105 heifers and sent to Logan-based Gossner Foods, Inc., where the milk is made into either cheese or a special kind of milk with a longer shelf life.

Bennett Farms

Bennett Farms is located in West Point at 968 North 4000 West. Bennett Farms was started in 1896 by one of the original settlers of West Point. Currently, Allen Bennett is the fourth-generation owner, and his son will be the fifth-generation owner. The farming operation consists of 350 acres, all under cultivation and furrow irrigation. Onions are the primary crop, with 60 acres producing about 66,000 50-pound sacks per year. The onions are marketed through Utah Onions. The farm also grows potatoes and tomatoes, which are sold at the farm or at roadside stands from Perry to Payson, Utah. Grain shell corn is grown and sold to local dairies, wheat is grown and sold to local livestock feeders, and alfalfa is grown and sold to local horse owners. Bennett Farms has two full-time employees and 15 seasonal employees.

4.3.7.2 Non-Century Farms of Interest

UDAF, the Utah Farm Bureau Federation, and individual farmers also provided UDOT with information for two non-Century Farms that contribute to the local fruit and vegetable market and economic well-being of the area and are of particular interest to the public for reasons



such as agri-tourism, agricultural education, or high economic production value. UDOT was not able to obtain information for all farms in the impact analysis area that might be of particular interest; however, the descriptions below provide an overview of typical farming operations and conditions in the impact analysis area.

Black Island Farms

Black Island Farms is a working vegetable farm located at 3179 South 3000 West in Syracuse that has about 400 acres in cultivation. The farm has been in operation continuously since the 1880s. The farm grows carrots, onions, cabbage, corn, pumpkins, squash, and gourds. Black Island Farms has been in the same family for more than 50 years. Each fall, the farm hosts a harvest festival and corn maze with hay rides, bonfires, and a haunted maze (called Nightmare Acres). About 48,000 people attended the farm's fall events and corn maze in 2010. Black Island Farms includes the state's first agricultural conservation easement, which consists of 40 acres of farmland that borders the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve. The primary purpose of the easement is to preserve the farmland and protect it from development. The only permitted use on the 40-acre easement is agriculture.

In a January 2012 article titled "Food for Thought: Local Farmers Fight for Agricultural Survival" (Lewis 2012), Charlie Black, owner of Black Island Farms at that time, stated that their biggest "crop" is their annual corn maze, which keeps them going financially. Mr. Black further stated that he began to diversify his Syracuse vegetable farm when it became clear that farming alone wouldn't pay the bills. Since then, his farm has started selling at farmers' markets, participating in CSAs, and offering agri-tourism including the corn maze, hay rides, and a harvest festival.

Utah Onions

Utah Onions is a grower, shipper, and packager of onions. Utah Onions is one of the nation's leading grower-shippers of yellow, red, white, sweet, and organic onions. The facility, located at 850 South 2000 West in Syracuse, is one of Utah's largest onion-packing facilities. Utah Onions grows, packs, and ships onions that it produces and also packs and ships onions that it buys from other local producers. According to geographic information systems (GIS) data obtained for the WDC Project, onions are grown on 582 acres in the impact analysis area (Utah Division of Water Resources 2013). The production of onions ideally needs a 5-year rotation to raise a disease-free, high-quality crop.

Since 2006, Utah Onions has purchased from its growers over \$11 million worth of onions, which equals over 2 million 50-pound bags. During that same period, Utah Onions had 15 full-time employees and over 40 seasonal employees with a payroll in excess of \$2.75 million. According to the Utah Farm Bureau Federation, in order to maintain "critical mass" for onion production, adequate acreage is required to rotate production areas to maintain soil integrity and control disease. Without adequate production acres, the Utah Onion Association, the onion grower's sales organization, will be unable to continue in business in Utah (Utah Farm Bureau Federation 2011).

4.4 Environmental Consequences

This section examines the effects of the WDC alternatives on farmland in the impact analysis area. The economic impacts to farm businesses are addressed in Chapter 8, Economics. The potential indirect impacts to farmlands caused by the WDC in the impact analysis area are evaluated in Chapter 23, Indirect Impacts. Indirect impacts to farmlands typically occur if the farmland is developed at a faster rate as a result of a project. However, most farmland in the impact analysis area is expected to be developed by the end of the study period, even with the No-Action Alternative, due to the rapid development occurring in the area.

The WDC action alternatives were evaluated equally in this chapter. However, to reduce repetitive discussions, if impacts from one alternative would be the same as impacts from a previously discussed alternative, the text is not repeated but instead references the previous analysis.

The WDC team coordinated with the following local governments and used the following current comprehensive plans and/or zoning regulations for all analyses of impacts to farmland:

- Clinton City (Clinton City Comprehensive Plan, updated 2013)
- Farmington City (Farmington City General Plan, 2011)
- Hooper City (Hooper City Future Land Use Plan, 2014)
- Kaysville City (Kaysville City General Plan, 2014)
- Layton City (Layton City General Plan, 2013)
- Syracuse City (Syracuse City General Plan, 2015)
- West Point City (West Point City General Plan Land Use Map, 2013)
- Davis County (Davis County General Plan, 2006)
- Weber County (West Central Weber County General Plan, 2003)

In addition, the following methodology was used to analyze specific types of impacts.

4.4.1 Methodology

4.4.1.1 Methodology for Determining Direct Impacts

All of the proposed WDC action alternatives would directly affect some farmland. There is some farmland within the proposed right-of-way of all of the action alternatives, and this farmland would be directly taken out of production (converted to non-agricultural use).

To assess the expected direct impacts to farmland from the proposed alternatives, the WDC team used aerial photographs and GIS analysis to identify the impacts to farmland, including cropland, FPPA-eligible farmland (that is, farmland designated as prime or of statewide or local importance, since there is no unique farmland in the impact analysis area), Century Farms, and APAs. Farmland impacts were evaluated based on information from several sources including the Utah Division of Water Resources' water inventory maps, the NRCS soil surveys of Davis and Weber Counties, field surveys along the proposed alternatives, reviews of aerial photos, parcel information (zoning classifications and acreage) from the



assessor's offices of Davis and Weber Counties, and coordination with local governments, canal companies, farm bureaus, and farmers.

The WDC team also analyzed potential farmland conversion to non-agricultural uses due to the fragmentation of farmland parcels. In addition to the direct impacts caused by the permanent conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use, some parcels that are not directly affected could ultimately be converted due to farmland fragmentation. Farmland fragmentation typically occurs when farmland is taken out of production because the remaining parcels are too small to farm, because access to remaining parcels is eliminated, or because traveling through a traffic corridor with farming equipment to access adjacent agriculture properties is not feasible. In these cases, the impact would be considered a farm displacement.

Farmland fragmentation impacts were determined by first identifying parcels that are being farmed. The WDC team made this identification by reviewing National Agricultural Imagery Program aerial photographs from 2015, reviewing city land-use records from 2015, and reviewing county parcel data that showed the type of use for each parcel. Next, the team noted the degree to which each farmed parcel would be affected by the alternatives. Farmed parcels could be affected as a strip take (a strip of farmland at the edge of the parcel would need to be acquired), a split take (the parcel would be split by an alternative), or a total take (the entire parcel would need to be acquired).

What are strip takes, split takes, and total takes?

A strip take is a type of acquisition in which a strip of farmland at the edge of the parcel would need to be acquired. With a split take, the parcel would be split by an alternative. With a total take, the entire parcel would need to be acquired.

Using GIS analysis and property records from the Davis and Weber County assessor's offices, the team calculated the total acreage of each parcel based on current conditions. Then the WDC alternatives were overlaid onto a map of the parcels to determine the acreage of the remaining land in agricultural production. For example, if an agricultural parcel of 100 acres would be bisected by an alternative and 10 acres would be required for the new highway, there might be two remaining parcels of 20 acres and 70 acres.

There is no specific guidance regarding the size at which a farmland remnant becomes too small to farm economically. However, according to the Utah Farmland Assessment Act, 5 acres is the size at which farmland can qualify for the assessment and taxation under the Farmland Assessment Act. In addition, farmland is not eligible to be given APA status if it is less than 5 contiguous acres; therefore, for the purpose of calculating farmland impacts due to bisecting parcels, agricultural parcels with less than 5 acres remaining were considered non-farmable and were considered to be directly affected.

Although this analysis uses 5 acres as the minimum farmable acreage, a farmer could decide that a parcel smaller than 5 acres is still suitable for farming. Many of the farm parcels in the impact analysis area are currently less than 5 acres. Even though those parcels are being farmed at less than 5 acres, any remnants of those parcels were included in the analysis under the assumption that the remaining portion of land would be too small to farm. Ultimately,

UDOT and the landowner would determine the viability of each affected farming operation on a case-by-case basis.

4.4.1.2 Methodology for Determining Impacts to FPPA-Eligible Farmland

The provisions of the FPPA (7 CFR 658) apply to the WDC Project. The analysis of impacts to FPPA-eligible farmland (that is, prime farmland and farmland of statewide or local importance) was coordinated with NRCS to comply with the FPPA. This act requires that each corridor under study (that is, the route of each proposed alternative) be evaluated to determine the impacts from the proposed project and the resulting conversion of identified prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance. Under the FPPA, federal agencies are required to submit a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (Form NRCS-CPA-106 for corridor-type projects) to NRCS. NRCS uses this information to evaluate whether there are farmlands subject to the FPPA requiring protection in the project area.

An NRCS-CPA-106 form was used to evaluate the impacts of each WDC action alternative on prime farmland and farmland of statewide or local importance (see Appendix 4A, Farmland Impact Rating Form). The main criteria used for this rating are the total acreages of prime farmland and farmland of statewide or local importance to be converted to a non-agricultural use (both directly and indirectly), the percentage of total acreage in the county, the degree of non-urban land use, the level of on-farm investments, the availability of state or local programs to protect farmland, the size of affected farms compared to the average, and the amount of land that would no longer be farmable due to the project.

If a corridor receives a total rating of less than 160 points, no further consideration for protection is given, and no additional sites need to be evaluated. If a corridor receives a total rating of 160 points or more, it receives higher levels of consideration for protection. These are the guidelines and criteria for assessing impacts and assigning ratings under 7 CFR 658.4 and 658.5.

Since the release of the Draft EIS, refinements to the WDC alignments were made resulting in fewer impacts to farmlands; however, the WDC action alternatives would still permanently convert some prime farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance to a non-agricultural use. In compliance with the FPPA, on February 7, 2017, the WDC team resubmitted Parts I and III of the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form (NRCS-CPA-106) and maps of the refined WDC alternatives to NRCS for its determination about whether any part of the project site is farmland subject to the FPPA. NRCS reviewed and completed Parts II, IV, and V in February 2017 and gave all alternatives a rating of 83 points for the relative value of the farmland that would be converted. Appendix 4A, Farmland Impact Rating Form, includes completed Form NRCS-CPA-106 and supporting data for all of the action alternatives.

According to federal regulation 7 CFR 658.4, sites receiving a total score of less than 160 points shall be given a minimal level of consideration for protection, and no additional sites need to be evaluated. Sites receiving a total score of 160 or greater shall be given stronger consideration for protection, including the evaluation of alternative sites, locations, or designs.

The total amount of prime farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance that would be needed for right-of-way for the WDC action alternatives ranges from 120 acres to 154 acres. The total site assessment criteria scores for the alternatives range from 185 points to 191 points, all of which are over the 160-point threshold.

Since the ratings for all of the WDC action alternatives are above the 160-point threshold, NRCS, as an administrator of the FPPA, recommends that FHWA consider the following issues as described under 7 CFR 658.4 and 658.5:

- Use of land that is not farmland or use of existing structures
- Alternate sites, locations, and designs that would serve the proposed project purpose but would convert fewer acres of farmland or other farmland that has a lower relative value
- Special siting requirements of the proposed project and the extent to which an alternate site fails to satisfy the special siting requirements as well as the originally selected site

4.4.1.3 Methodology for Determining Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas

As described in Section 4.2.3, Agriculture Protection Areas, APAs cannot be condemned for highway purposes unless (1) the landowner requests the removal of the designation or (2) the applicable legislative body (that is, the legislative body of the county, city, or town in which the APA is located) and the APA advisory board approve the condemnation, provided that “there is no reasonable and prudent alternative to the use of the land within the Agriculture Protection Area for the project” [Utah Administrative Code, Section 17-41-405(4)(a)]. If protected agricultural areas remain in agricultural use, farm equipment access must be provided to allow landowners to move farm machinery between parcels.

As part of the APA process, UDOT consulted with the State of Utah Agricultural Commissioner to determine whether there is no reasonable and prudent alternative to the use of the land within the APAs that would be used by the project. Because Davis County has numerous APAs, it was not possible to avoid them entirely with the WDC alternatives. UDAF concurred with the determination that there is no prudent and feasible alternative for the WDC that would avoid APAs (see Appendix 4B, Farmland Correspondence).

Using GIS software and the locations of APAs, the WDC team calculated the number and acreage of APAs that would be affected by each alternative. The impact analysis area includes 114 APA parcels that contain about 1,989 acres of mostly irrigated farmland. Given the number of APAs and the developed nature of the impact analysis area, the only way to avoid APAs completely would be to move the alignments into developed areas, which would require substantial residential relocations. Therefore, there is no reasonable or prudent alternative to the use of the land within the APAs for the project.

However, as described in Section 4.4.1, Methodology, the WDC team did make minor shifts to sections of the alternative alignments to minimize impacts to farmland—including APAs—

without substantially increasing property relocations. As shown in Table 4-8, Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas from Alternatives A1–A2, on page 4-25 and Table 4-12, Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas from Alternatives B1–B2, on page 4-31, the alternatives would affect between one and 11 individual APAs, thereby converting between about 3 acres and 42 acres of farmland within the APAs to a non-agricultural use.

4.4.2 No-Action Alternative

With the No-Action Alternative, the WDC would not be constructed, so no impacts to farmlands would occur as a result of the WDC. With the expected population growth through 2040 with both the No-Action and action alternatives, continued urban development in the impact analysis area would potentially continue to convert existing farmland to residential and commercial uses.

As discussed in Chapter 24, Cumulative Impacts, the data on projected growth provided by the Utah Governor’s Office of Management and Budget show much of the farmland in the impact analysis area as becoming residential areas. Based on future population projections (GOMB 2008), between 2005 and 2040, about 66,000 acres of mostly agricultural land (farmland and pasture) are projected to be lost to development in Davis and Weber Counties.

It’s reasonable to assume that the majority of the projected lost agricultural land will likely be converted to the projected additional developed land, since most of the other open space in Davis and Weber Counties is either under conservation easements or part of the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve and is therefore ineligible for development. These trends would likely continue with either the No-Action or WDC action alternatives.

4.4.3 Alternatives A1–A2

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, Alternative A is the more westerly alternative and consists of two separate alternatives: Alternatives A1 and A2. These alternatives are defined in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5. Components of Alternatives A1–A2

Alternative	I-15 Connection	Four-Lane Highway	Two-Lane Highway	West Point/ Hooper Cities Segment	North Terminus
A1	Glovers Lane	I-15 to 2000 West	2000 West to 1800 North	4100 West	1800 West (West Point)
A2	Glovers Lane	I-15 to 2000 West	2000 West to 5500 South	5400 West	5500 South (Hooper)

Provided below is the impact analysis for the farmland that would be affected by Alternatives A1 and A2. Table 4-6 summarizes the farmland impacts from Alternatives A1 and A2, and Table 4-7 below summarizes the cropland impacts.

Table 4-6. Farmland Impacts from Alternatives A1–A2

in acres rounded to the nearest whole number

Alternative	Irrigated Cropland ^a	Non-irrigated Cropland	Prime Farmland	Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance	Agriculture Protection Areas	Century Farms	Farmland Remnants ^b
A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W	544	85	134	16	23	21	41
A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W	605	85	138	16	40	31	50

^a Includes sub-irrigated cropland.

^b Includes farmland that is severed in such a way that the remaining parcels would be smaller than 5 acres.

Table 4-7. Cropland Impacts from Alternatives A1–A2

in acres rounded to the nearest whole number

Crop or Farmland Type	Existing	A1	A2
<i>Irrigated Crops or Farmland</i>			
Alfalfa	5,237	54	97
Beans	148	11	11
Berries	15	7	7
Corn	2,317	45	59
Grain	1,782	41	46
Grass hay	472	23	23
Onions	582	9	14
Other vegetables	216	15	15
Pasture	5,583	201	195
Pasture, sub-irrigated	3,558	108	108
Turf farms	118	30	30
Total irrigated	20,280	544	605
Percent of existing		2.7%	3.0%
<i>Non-irrigated Crops or Farmland</i>			
Dry alfalfa/grain/seed	49	5	5
Dry idle	238	6	6
Dry pasture	323	23	23
Fallow – irrigated land	89	1	1
Idle – irrigated land	2,356	50	50
Total non-irrigated	3,055	85	85
Percent of existing		2.8%	2.8%
Total cropland impacts		629	690

4.4.3.1 Alternative A1 – Glovers Lane and 4100 West/1800 North

Cropland

Alternative A1 would convert about 544 acres of irrigated cropland and about 85 acres of non-irrigated cropland for a total of 629 acres of impacts to cropland, which is about 3% of the total cropland in the impact analysis area. The largest impact to cropland would be to irrigated pasture (201 acres). The crop that would be most affected by Alternative A1 is alfalfa (54 acres). It's important to note that Utah Onions' main facility located at 850 South 2000 West in Syracuse is one of Utah's largest onion-packing facilities. There are onion growers in both the Davis and Weber County portions of the impact analysis area, and about 582 acres of farmland in the impact analysis area are dedicated to growing onions.

Alternative A1 would convert about 9 acres of cropland used to grow onions, which is about 1.5% of the cropland in the impact analysis area currently being used to grow onions. This

conversion could affect the supply of onions that is processed by Utah Onions. The impacts to farmland and cropland are shown in Table 4-6 and Table 4-7 above.

FPPA-Eligible Farmland

As shown in Table 4-6 above, Alternative A1 would convert about 134 acres of prime farmland, which is about 5% of the prime farmland in the impact analysis area, and about 16 acres of the farmland of statewide or local importance, which is about 36% of the farmland of statewide or local importance in the impact analysis area. There is no unique farmland in the impact analysis area. As described in Section 4.3.4, Cropland, the FPPA considers land that is within city limits to be “committed to other uses,” and such land needs no further evaluation under the FPPA. Therefore, only farmland that is in the impact analysis area but is outside municipal boundaries is considered in the FPPA analysis.

A Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form (Form NRCS-CPA-106) was completed and sent to NRCS for its review and comment. Using the NRCS-CPA-106 rating form, Alternative A1 is rated 190 points (see Appendix 4A, Farmland Impact Rating Form), which is over the 160-point threshold at which special measures and alternatives must be considered.

Agriculture Protection Areas

As shown in Table 4-8 below, six individual APA parcels would be affected by Alternative A1. The combined acreage that would be converted in the six APA parcels is 23 acres.

APAs are not completely protected from development, but they are given special protections as described in Section 4.2.3, Agriculture Protection Areas. The APA status of these parcels would need to be removed in order for Alternative A1 or A2 to be built.

Removing the APA status would not be necessary until the right-of-way acquisition phase of the project, which would occur shortly before construction. If the owners of these parcels do not remove the APA status, the project could still be built using a provision in Utah state law that allows UDOT to condemn land for a highway purpose, in which case the applicable legislative body (that is, the legislative body of the county, city, or town in which the APA is located) and the APA advisory board could approve the condemnation, provided that “there is no reasonable and prudent alternative to the use of the land within the Agriculture Protection Area for the project” [Utah Administrative Code, Section 17-41-405(4)(a)]. If a highway is built adjacent to an APA and protected agricultural areas remain in agricultural use, farm equipment access must be provided to allow landowners to move farm machinery between parcels.

For more information about avoiding APAs, see Section 4.4.1.3, Methodology for Determining Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas.

Table 4-8. Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas from Alternatives A1–A2

in acres

Agriculture Protection Area by Parcel ID	A1	A2	Location^a
121020037	1.75	1.75	Davis County
121030021	4.49	4.49	Davis County
121020034	5.70	5.70	Davis County
121020038	6.64	6.64	Davis County
121020058	1.81	1.81	Davis County
121020057	2.61	2.61	Davis County
090810024	0.00	2.21	Hooper
140370012	0.00	4.59	West Point
140370013	0.00	4.14	West Point
140370019	0.00	4.54	West Point
140370032	0.00	1.52	West Point
Total	23	40	

Sources: Davis County 2008; Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center 2009; Utah Division of Water Resources 2015; Weber County 2010

^a Exact property addresses were not available for most parcels.

Century Farms

Of the 47 Century Farms in the impact analysis area, Alternative A1 would directly affect two of them: Call Farms in Layton and the Cook Farm in Syracuse. These two farms would lose agricultural land through strip takes. Alternative A1 would not completely displace any farm. A total of 21 acres associated with these two farms would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

As discussed in Section 4.2.4, Century Farms, Century Farms are recognized as important farming operations in the region. The potential effects of Alternative A1 or any of the other alternatives on the areas occupied by Century Farms would be evaluated, and verified effects would be mitigated as appropriate consistent with state and federal laws that address property acquisition. UDOT, in coordination with the property owner, would use a cost comparison to determine the viability of some farming operations based on impacts to infrastructure (such as irrigation and drainage), access, and the size of parcels remaining from strip takes. For more information, see Section 5.3.7, Methodology for Housing and Relocations.

Call Farms. Call Farms, a Century Farm located at 852 South 2200 West in Layton, would be affected by Alternative A1. Impacts would occur at the far western edge of the farm near the wetlands. Impacts would affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

Cook Farm. The Cook Farm, a Century Farm located on Gentile Street between 2400 West and 2700 West in Syracuse, would be affected by Alternative A1. Impacts would occur at the

southern part of the farm. Impacts would affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

Non-Century Farms of Interest

In addition to the Century Farm impacts described above, another farm profiled in Section 4.3.7.2, Non-Century Farms of Interest, would also be affected by Alternative A1.

Black Island Farms. Black Island Farms, located at 3179 South 3000 West in Syracuse, would be affected by Alternative A1. Impacts would occur at the far southern edge of the farm near the wetlands. It is the WDC team's understanding that Black Island Farms' agri-tourism activities take place around the farmstead north of Alternative A1; the area used for those activities would not be directly affected by the alternative. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

In addition to Black Island Farms, Alternative A1 might affect other farms that contribute to the local fruit and vegetable market and the economic well-being of the area or are of particular interest to the public for reasons such as agri-tourism, agricultural education, or high economic production value.

Farmland Fragmentation

Alternative A1 would directly affect some farmland because it would split farmland parcels in such a way that the remaining parcels would be smaller than 5 acres, or because it would require right-of-way at the edge of a parcel (strip take) and the remnant would be less than 5 acres.

These impacts could create irregularly shaped fields, could divide the farm residence and/or buildings from farm fields, and could require farmers to travel farther to work the fields. According to local farmers, bisecting farmland could create drainage, watering, and access problems and could break up the micro-climate unique to the impact analysis area. Affecting this micro-climate would affect the ability of farmers to make a living and would disturb the adjacent wetlands (McKitrick 2011; Davidson and McKitrick 2011). Others who commented on the WDC contend that, when agricultural land is bisected, the value of the land for food production is lost, leaving the value only for continued development of urban sprawl (Davis, no date). Some area farmers also stated that traveling around traffic corridors with farming equipment to access adjacent agriculture properties is not feasible and presents additional traffic flow problems and safety hazards (Mickelson 2011).

Alternative A1 would directly affect about 41 acres of farmland through farmland fragmentation. About 18 acres (44%) of these 41 acres are prime farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance. In some cases, severing the parcels would create two farmable parcels, and the only loss of farmland would be that converted to right-of-way for the WDC. In other cases, severing the parcels would create small remnant parcels. Depending on several factors, such as adjacency to neighboring farms, access, and utilities (such as irrigation and power systems), these small remnant parcels might be farmable. For example, the parcels

might be farmable if neighboring farms acquire them or if the same owner farms adjacent parcels.

Some farmers might feel that the remaining parcels are too small for farm, while others might continue to farm, especially if other farmland is adjacent to the remnant and if access to the remnant is still available. UDOT and the landowner would determine the viability of each farming operation on a case-by-case basis.

The above farmland analysis is intended to determine the impact to land used for agricultural production, not how the current owner of the property would be affected or whether the owner believes that the farm operation would still be profitable. The impacts to the agricultural economy and farm businesses are addressed in Chapter 8, Economics.

4.4.3.2 Alternative A2 – Glovers Lane and 5400 West/5500 South Cropland

Alternative A2 would convert about 605 acres of irrigated cropland and about 85 acres of non-irrigated cropland for a total of 690 acres of impacts to cropland, which is about 3% of the total cropland in the impact analysis area. As with Alternative A1, the main farmland type affected would be irrigated pasture (195 acres), followed by alfalfa (97 acres). The impacts to onion farming and the potential effect on Utah Onions' main facility would be 14 acres. The impacts to cropland or farmland are shown in Table 4-7 above, Cropland Impacts from Alternatives A1–A2.

FPPA-Eligible Farmland

As shown in Table 4-6 above, Alternative A2 would convert about 4 more acres of prime farmland compared to Alternative A1 for a total of 138 acres of prime farmland, which is about 5.5% of the prime farmland in the impact analysis area. Impacts to farmland of statewide or local importance would be the same as from Alternative A1 (16 acres), which is about 36% of the farmland of statewide or local importance in the impact analysis area. Using the NRCS-CPA-106 rating form, Alternative A2 is rated 191 points (see Appendix 4A, Farmland Impact Rating Form), which is over the 160-point threshold at which special measures and alternatives must be considered.

Agriculture Protection Areas

As shown in Table 4-8 above, Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas from Alternatives A1–A2, 11 individual APA parcels would be affected by Alternative A2. The combined acreage that would be converted in the 11 APA parcels would be 40 acres. See Section 4.4.3.1, Alternative A1 – Glovers Lane and 4100 West, for a more general discussion of impacts to APAs.

Century Farms

Of the 47 Century Farms in the impact analysis area, Alternative A2 would directly affect five of them. Alternative A2 would have the same effect on two Century Farms (Call Farms and the Cook Farm) as Alternative A1 plus effects on the Dale O Christensen, Fowers, and Lyle Johnston Farms. A total of 31 acres of farmland associated with Century Farms would be converted to non-agricultural use.

Dale O Christensen Farm. The Dale O Christensen Farm in Hooper is a Century Farm located at about 5721 South 5500 West. Alternative A2 would bisect the farm and would affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. Alternative A2 would separate a structure associated with the farm from the adjoining farmland parcels to the east. Access to parcels might also be affected. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

Fowers Farm. The Fowers Farm is a Century Farm located at about 2742 North 5000 West in Hooper. Alternative A2 would go through the middle of the farm parcels and would affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

Lyle Johnston Farm. The Lyle Johnston Farm is a Century Farm located at about 2005 North 4500 West in West Point. Alternative A2 would affect the westernmost parcel of farmland. Impacts would affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

Other Non-Century Farms of Interest

The impacts to other non-Century Farms of interest from Alternative A2 would be the same as those from Alternative A1.

Farmland Fragmentation

Alternative A2 would directly affect about 50 acres of farmland through fragmentation. About 18 acres (36%) of these 50 acres are prime farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance.

4.4.4 Alternatives B1–B2

As described in Chapter 2, Alternatives, Alternative B is the more easterly alternative and consists of two separate alternatives: Alternatives B1 and B2. These alternatives are defined in Table 4-9.

Table 4-9. Components of Alternatives B1–B2

Alternative	I-15 Connection	Four-Lane Highway	Two-Lane Highway	West Point City Segment	North Terminus
B1	Glovers Lane	I-15 to Antelope Drive ^a	Antelope Drive to 1800 North	4100 West	1800 North (West Point)
B2	Glovers Lane	I-15 to Antelope Drive ^a	Antelope Drive to 1800 North	4800 West	1800 North (West Point)

^a The transition from a four-lane highway to a two-lane highway would occur between Antelope Drive and 700 South.

Provided below is the impact analysis for the farmland that would be affected by Alternatives B1 and B2. Table 4-10 summarizes the farmland impacts from Alternatives B1 and B2, and Table 4-11 below summarizes the cropland impacts.

Table 4-10. Farmland Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2

in acres rounded to nearest whole number

Alternative	Irrigated Cropland ^a	Non-irrigated Cropland	Prime Farmland	Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance	Agriculture Protection Areas	Century Farms	Farmland Remnants ^b
B1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W	529	79	104	16	3	15	28
B2 – Glovers Lane/4800 W	532	79	104	16	4	15	36

^a Includes sub-irrigated cropland.

^b Includes farmland that is severed in such a way that the remaining parcels would be smaller than 5 acres.

Table 4-11. Cropland Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2

in acres rounded to the nearest whole number

Crop or Farmland Type	Existing	B1	B2
<i>Irrigated Crops or Farmland</i>			
Alfalfa	5,237	16	29
Beans	148	11	11
Berries	15	7	7
Corn	2,317	27	29
Grain	1,782	21	21
Grass hay	472	23	23
Onions	582	9	11
Other vegetables	216	10	10
Pasture	5,583	231	217
Pasture, sub-irrigated	3,558	144	144
Turf farms	118	30	30
Total irrigated	20,280	529	532
Percent of existing		2.6%	2.6%
<i>Non-irrigated Crops or Farmland</i>			
Dry alfalfa grain/seeds	49	1	1
Dry idle	238	6	6
Dry pasture	89	23	23
Fallow – irrigated land	2,356	0	0
Idle – irrigated land	49	49	49
Total non-irrigated	3,055	79	79
Percent of existing		2.6%	2.6%
Total cropland impacts		608	611

4.4.4.1 Alternative B1 – Glovers Lane and 4100 West/1800 North

Cropland

Alternative B1 would convert about 529 acres of irrigated cropland and about 79 acres of non-irrigated cropland for a total of 608 acres of impacts to cropland, which is less than 3% of the total cropland in the impact analysis area. The largest impacts to cropland would be to irrigated pasture (231 acres) and sub-irrigated pasture (144 acres). All other crops would have impacts of 30 acres or less. Of the 582 acres of farmland in the impact analysis area that are dedicated to growing onions, Alternative B1 would convert about 9 acres (about 1.5%) of the land to non-agricultural uses. This conversion could affect the supply that is processed by Utah Onions. The impacts to farmland and cropland are shown in Table 4-10 and Table 4-11 above.

FPPA-Eligible Farmland

As shown in Table 4-10 above, Alternative B1 would convert about 104 acres of prime farmland, which is about 4% of the prime farmland in the impact analysis area, and about 16 acres of farmland of statewide or local importance, which is about 36% of the farmland of statewide or local importance in the impact analysis area.

Using the NRCS-CPA-106 rating form, Alternative B1 is rated 185 points (see Appendix 4A, Farmland Impact Rating Form), which is over the 160-point threshold at which special measures and alternatives must be considered. Note that, of all the alternatives, Alternative B1 has the lowest total number of points per the CPA-106 rating form.

Agriculture Protection Areas

As shown in Table 4-12, one individual APA parcel would be affected by Alternative B1. The acreage that would be converted in the APA parcel is less than 2.64 acres. See Section 4.4.3.1, Alternative A1 – Glovers Lane and 4100 West, for a more general discussion of impacts to APAs.

Table 4-12. Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas from Alternatives B1–B2

in acres

Agriculture Protection Area by Parcel ID	B1	B2	Location^a
120960052	2.64	2.64	Syracuse
140370012	0.00	1.81	West Point
Total	2.64	4.45	

Sources: Davis County 2008; Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center 2009; Utah Division of Water Resources 2015; Weber County 2010

^a Exact property addresses were not available for most parcels.

Century Farms

Of the 47 Century Farms in the impact analysis area, Alternative B1 would directly affect three of them: Call Farms in Layton, the Briggs Dairy in Syracuse, and the Cook Farm in Syracuse. The impacts to Call Farms and the Cook Farm would be from strip takes that could affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. While none of the buildings or farmland associated with the Briggs Dairy operation would be affected, Alternative B1 would directly affect two residential structures located along Bluff Road and associated with the Briggs property. A total of about 15 acres associated with these three farms would be converted to non-agricultural use.

Alternative B1 would not completely displace any farm. UDOT, in coordination with the property owner, would use a cost comparison to determine the viability of some farming operations based on impacts to infrastructure (such as irrigation and drainage), access, and the

size of the parcels remaining from strip takes. For more information, see Section 5.3.7, Methodology for Housing and Relocations.

Call Farms. Call Farms, a Century Farm located at 852 South 2200 West in Layton, would be affected by Alternative B1. Impacts would occur at the far western edge of the farm near the wetlands. Impacts would affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

Briggs Dairy. The Briggs Dairy is a Century Farm located at 1235 South and 3000 West in Syracuse. Although none of the buildings or farmland associated with the dairy operation would be affected, both of the B Alternatives would directly affect two residential structures located along Bluff Road and associated with the dairy. For more information, see Section 5.3.7, Methodology for Housing and Relocations.

Cook Farm. The Cook Farm, a Century Farm located on Gentile Street between 2400 West and 2700 West in Syracuse, would be affected by Alternative B1. Impacts would occur at the northern part of the farm. Impacts would affect agricultural operations, primarily through the loss of agricultural land. No structures associated with the farm would be affected.

Other Non–Century Farms of Interest

Alternative B1 might affect non–Century Farms that contribute to the local fruit and vegetable market and the economic well-being of the area or are of particular interest to the public for reasons such as agri-tourism, agricultural education, or high economic production value. Black Island Farms, profiled in Section 4.3.7.2, Non–Century Farms of Interest, would not be affected by Alternative B1 or B2.

Farmland Fragmentation

Alternative B1 would directly affect about 28 acres of farmland through fragmentation. About 13 acres (46%) of these 28 acres are prime farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance.

4.4.4.2 Alternative B2 – Glovers Lane and 4800 West/1800 North

Cropland

Alternative B2 would convert about 532 acres of irrigated cropland and about 79 acres of non-irrigated cropland for a total of 611 acres of impacts to cropland, which is about 3% of the total cropland in the impact analysis area. Of the B Alternatives, Alternative B2 would convert the most cropland in the impact analysis area. As with Alternative B1, the largest impacts to cropland would be to irrigated pasture (217 acres) and sub-irrigated pasture (144 acres). For the most part, all other crops would have impacts of 30 acres or less.

Alternative B2 would affect 11 acres of onions. Less than 2% of the land used to grow onions would be converted to non-agricultural use, and the impact to Utah Onions' main facility would be the same as from Alternative A1. The impacts to farmland and cropland are shown in Table 4-10 above, Farmland Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2, and Table 4-11 above, Cropland Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2.

FPPA-Eligible Farmland

As shown in Table 4-10 above, Farmland Impacts from Alternatives B1–B2, Alternative B2 would convert about 104 acres of prime farmland, which is about 4% of the prime farmland in the impact analysis area, and about 16 acres of farmland of statewide or local importance, which accounts for about 36% of the farmland of statewide or local importance in the impact analysis area.

Using the NRCS-CPA-106 rating form, Alternative B2 is rated 190 points (see Appendix 4A, Farmland Impact Rating Form), which is over the 160-point threshold at which special measures and alternatives must be considered.

Agriculture Protection Areas

As shown in Table 4-12 above, Impacts to Agriculture Protection Areas from Alternatives B1–B2, two individual APA parcels would be affected by Alternative B2. The combined acreage that would be converted in the six APA parcels is about 4.45 acres. See Section 4.4.3.1, Alternative A1 – Glovers Lane and 4100 West, for a more general discussion of impacts to APAs.

Century Farms

Of the 47 Century Farms in the impact analysis area, Alternative B2 would have the same effect on three Century Farms affected by Alternative B1.

Other Non-Century Farms of Interest

The impacts to other non-Century Farms of interest from Alternative B2 would be the same as those from Alternative B1.

Farmland Fragmentation

Alternative B2 would directly affect about 36 acres of farmland through fragmentation. About 13 acres (36%) of these 36 acres are prime farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance.

4.4.5 Wetland Avoidance Options

Two wetland avoidance options are being evaluated in this Final EIS, as shown in Table 4-13. The purpose of these options is to avoid wetland impacts per guidance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on wetland avoidance. Either wetland avoidance option could be implemented with any of the A or B Alternatives.

In this section, the impact information for the wetland avoidance options provides only the differences in impacts for the A and B Alternatives as a result of using the wetland avoidance options. The differences in impacts would apply to any of the A and B Alternatives if they were to use the wetland avoidance options.

Table 4-13. Components of the Wetland Avoidance Options

Option	Location	City	Description
Farmington	Prairie View Drive and West Ranches Road	Farmington	Shift the A and B Alternatives in Farmington about 150 feet east to the southwest side of the intersection of Prairie View Drive and West Ranches Road.
Layton	2200 West and 1000 South	Layton	Shift the A and B Alternatives in Layton about 500 feet east to the northeast side of the intersection of 2200 West and 1000 South.

The wetland avoidance options would have the following changes to the impacts for Alternatives A1, A2, B1, and B2:

- 5 fewer acres of impacts to irrigated and non-irrigated cropland
- 10 fewer acres of impacts to prime farmland
- No change to the impact to farmland of statewide or local importance
- No change to the impact to APAs
- 1 more acre of impact to a Century Farm
- About 1 fewer acre of farmland fragmentation

Overall, the impacts from the wetland avoidance options would be similar to those from Alternatives A1, A2, B1, and B2.

4.4.6 Mitigation Measures

4.4.6.1 Cropland, Century Farms, and Other Non–Century Farms of Interest

Owners of farmland and farm-related businesses within the WDC right-of-way will be compensated according to the requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and other state and federal guidelines if the owners' properties are affected by project construction. UDOT will ensure that affected irrigation infrastructure is replaced, ditch flow across the WDC is maintained, and all water use is maintained.

If irrigation infrastructure is replaced, the system will be designed to carry sufficient head pressure in order to deliver the needed flows and carrying capacity to get the water to the “end of the row.” Irrigation will be maintained during construction. If during the right-of-way negotiations UDOT determines that providing irrigation to affected parcels is unreasonable, UDOT, in coordination with the property owner, will evaluate acquisition of the parcel.

4.4.6.2 FPPA-Eligible Farmland

Since the ratings for all of the action alternatives are above the 160-point threshold, NRCS, as an administrator of the FPPA, recommends that FHWA consider the following issues as described under 7 CFR 658.4 and 658.5:

- Use of land that is not farmland or use of existing structures
- Alternate sites, locations, and designs that would serve the proposed project purpose but would convert fewer acres of farmland or other farmland that has a lower relative value
- Special siting requirements of the proposed project and the extent to which an alternate site fails to satisfy the special siting requirements as well as the originally selected site

As discussed in Chapter 2, Alternatives, an extensive alternatives analysis was conducted to develop the project alternatives. During the alternatives-refinement process, the WDC team made efforts to shift the alignments of the alternatives to be either on the edges of farm properties or on the parcel lines in some areas (instead of going through the middle of some farm properties). During the alternatives-refinement process, the WDC team also changed the Syracuse alignment of Alternative B from the previous alignment, which further reduced impacts to farmland in Syracuse.

However, because of the existing urban development and wetlands in the project area, alternatives that would avoid farmland would affect either homes and businesses or wetlands. The alternatives that were developed that met the project's purpose were refined during the alternatives-development process to convert the minimum amount of farmland while avoiding or minimizing impacts to existing developments and wetlands. The shifts moved the WDC alignments to the edges of farmland to avoid bisecting a farmland and thereby



potentially rendering the entire parcel as not usable for farming. Therefore, the requirements of the FPPA have been met, and, to the maximum extent practicable, adverse agricultural impacts have been minimized or avoided.

Alternative B1 has the lowest NRCS-CPA-106 rating at 185 points and would have the lowest overall farmland impacts; however, no single alternative is rated under the 160-point threshold. No further mitigation is proposed.

4.4.6.3 Farmland Fragmentation

For farmland fragmentation impacts, UDOT, in coordination with the property owner, will attempt to resolve conflicts; for example, by arranging additional property transfers to consolidate ownership. However, UDOT might not be able to resolve all issues created by severing parcels and would offer compensation to landowners who demonstrate a hardship due to severed parcels.

In addition, UDOT will consider options to provide access between the bisected farm segments. If a bisected farm segment (remnant) is too small to continue to use for agricultural purposes (that is, under 5 acres), UDOT will evaluate acquisition of the remnant with the property owner.

4.4.6.4 Agriculture Protection Areas

Officials with Davis and Weber Counties have identified the parcels that are protected by APAs defined by Utah Code. Prior to construction, UDOT will coordinate with the affected property owners who have land in an APA. Removing the APA status would require the approval of the landowner and either the Davis or Weber County Commission.

4.4.7 Cumulative Impacts

As described in Chapter 30, Public and Agency Consultation and Coordination, at the beginning of the EIS process, scoping meetings were held with the public and resource agencies to help identify issues to be analyzed in this EIS. The comments received during the public and agency scoping period were reviewed to determine whether any significant issues were identified.

The public identified the loss of farmlands as a major concern. The scoping comments can be reviewed in the project's *Scoping Summary Report* (West Davis Corridor Team 2010). Chapter 24, Cumulative Impacts, provides a detailed analysis of the potential cumulative impacts to farmlands. This section provides a summary of that analysis.

The proposed WDC alternatives would convert between 608 acres of agricultural land (up to 636 acres if severed parcels are included) with Alternative B1 (the alternative with the least impact to farmland) and 690 acres of agricultural land (up to 740 acres if severed parcels are included) with Alternative A2 (the alternative with the most impact to farmland), or less than 1% of the total agricultural land currently in Davis and Weber Counties. Other planned transportation projects listed in Table 24-1, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Transit and Roadway Actions, would result in less than 100 acres of additional impacts to agricultural land; the main contributor will continue to be the urban growth that will occur through 2040 in Weber and Davis Counties.

As described in Chapter 24, Cumulative Impacts, future regional development is likely to convert up to 66,000 acres of agricultural land. Using available data starting with the 1974 farmland census, past and future actions, including any direct and indirect agricultural impacts from the WDC, could result in a total loss of 69% of the total farmland in Weber and Davis Counties (about 230,000 acres). With the direct impacts from the WDC, the total loss would still be about 69%.

The loss of farmland from the expected urban growth could affect the sustainability of farming in Davis County because farmers rely on sharing resources to stay competitive. The loss of numerous farming operations could make farming not viable for smaller farming operations. Note that converting farmland to development is an economic decision made by the private landowner. Although the WDC would affect some farming operations, it would not contribute enough to cumulative impacts to be the final cause of the loss of farming operations in Davis County. If farmers sell their land for development, this would ultimately cause the loss of sustainable farming in the area. Overall, the WDC would contribute less than 1% of the total loss in farmland and would not substantially add to the cumulative impacts.

What are cumulative impacts?

Cumulative impacts are the resulting impacts from the proposed action combined with impacts from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

4.4.8 Summary of Impacts

As shown in Table 4-14, the A Alternatives would have more impacts to irrigated cropland, non-irrigated farmland, prime farmland, APAs, and Century Farms than the B Alternatives. Alternatives A1–A2 and Alternatives B1–B2 would each convert less than 3% of the cropland in the impact analysis area to non-agricultural use. Additionally, the total amount of FPPA-regulated farmland (that is, prime farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance) that would be needed for right-of-way for the action alternatives ranges from 120 acres to 154 acres. The total FPPA site assessment criteria scores for the alternatives range from 185 points to 191 points, all of which are over the 160-point threshold. Although none of the A or B Alternatives is under the 160-point threshold for FPPA-regulated farmland per the NRCS CPA-106 rating criteria, Alternative B1 has the lowest score at 185 points.

In general, Alternative A2 would have the greatest amount of farmland impacts and Alternative B1 would have the least amount of farmland impacts of all action alternatives. Alternative A2 would convert 138 acres of prime farmland, while Alternative B1 would convert 104 acres of prime farmland. Alternative A2 would affect 11 APA parcels and about 40 acres of farmland within the APAs, Alternative A1 would affect 6 APA parcels and about 23 acres of farmland within the APAs, Alternative B1 would affect one APA parcel and about 3 acres of farmland within the APAs, and Alternative B2 would affect two APA parcels and about 4 acres of farmland within the APAs. Therefore, Alternative B1 would best meet the intent of Utah APA law.

Table 4-14. Summary of Farmland Impacts by WDC Alternative

in acres rounded to nearest whole number

Alternative	Irrigated Cropland ^a	Non-irrigated Cropland	Prime Farmland	Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance	Agriculture Protection Areas	Century Farms	Farmland Remnants ^b
A1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W	544	85	134	16	23	21	41
A2 – Glovers Lane/5400 W	605	85	138	16	40	31	50
A1 – Wetland Avoidance Option	540	84	125	16	23	22	40
A2 – Wetland Avoidance Option	601	84	129	16	40	32	49
B1 – Glovers Lane/4100 W	529	79	104	16	3	15	28
B2 – Glovers Lane/4800 W	532	79	104	16	4	15	36
B1 – Wetland Avoidance Option	525	78	94	16	3	16	27
B2 – Wetland Avoidance Option	528	78	94	16	4	16	35

^a Includes sub-irrigated cropland.

^b Includes farmland that is severed in such a way that the remaining parcels would be smaller than 5 acres.



4.5 References

Albers, Meredith

2017 Email communication between Albers, NRCS, and Heidi Spoor of HDR Engineering regarding prime and unique farmland. April 26.

Davidson, Lee, and Cathy McKitrick

2011 UDOT Tweaks Legacy North to Save Homes, Farms. www.tribpreps.com/sltrib/politics/52544482-90/homes-udot-west-highway.html.csp?page=2. *Salt Lake Tribune*, September 9.

Davis County

2008 Davis County – Davis County Planning GIS data, filename DavisCo_PARCEL_LAND_VIEW_20081027.shp, dated April 2009.

Davis, Monty

No date AgriUtah: Best Route for West Davis Corridor. agriutah.com/WhatUtahWants.aspx. Accessed June 5, 2012.

Downen, John C.

2009 Utah's Urban Farmers: Agricultural Activity on the Wasatch Front. bebr.utah.edu/Documents/uebr/UEBR2009/UEBR2009no3.pdf. *Utah Economic and Business Review*, Vol. 69, No. 3.

[GOMB] Utah Governor's Office of Management and Budget, State and Local Planning Section

2008 2008 Baseline Report: Current Conditions, Trends, and Projections.

HDR Engineering, Inc.

2012 Minutes from a meeting with the Utah Farm Service Agency regarding economic impacts to farmlands from the WDC Project. March 29.

Illinois Department of Revenue

2012 Publication 122: Instructions for Farmland Assessments. www.revenue.state.il.us/publications/pubs/pub-122.pdf. January.

Lewis, Dianne

2012 Food for Thought: Local Farmers Fight for Agricultural Survival. dev.utahbusiness.com/articles/view/food_for_thought. *Utah Business*, January 1.

McKitrick, Cathy

2011 West Davis Corridor Plans Would Bisect Remaining Farmland. www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/51657789-78/utah-onions-davis-corridor.html.csp. *Salt Lake Tribune*, April 20.

Mickelson, T.

2011 A Better Alternative: Protecting Utah's Farms and Prime Soils for Food Production while Protecting and Enhancing Wetlands and Open Space. March 8.



[NRCS] Natural Resources Conservation Service

- 1999 LNU – Field Office Workload Reduction – Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). Recommendation to stop making determinations under the FPPA where local zoning takes precedence. www.dot.ca.gov/ser/downloads/memos/Farmlands_Workload_Reduction.pdf. April 30.
- 2003 Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program, Part 519, Subpart D – Program Eligibility. directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/viewDirective.aspx?id=1985. Accessed May 9, 2007.
- 2010 Soil Survey. March.

Olsen, Shawn

- 2011 Century Farms – Davis County. extension.usu.edu/davis/htm/agriculture/century-farms-in-davis-county. Accessed April 19, 2012.

Speth, Gus

- 1980 Prime and Unique Agricultural Lands and the Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/exec81180.html. August.

[UDAF] Utah Department of Agriculture and Food

- 2012 Personal communication between Johnson, Utah Department of Agriculture and Food, and Rosemary Fasselin of HDR Engineering regarding Century Farms. January 18.

[USDA] U.S. Department of Agriculture

- 2007 2007 Census of Agriculture.
- 2014 2012 Census of Agriculture.

Utah Agricultural Experiment Station

- 1983 Important Farmlands of Davis County. Research Report No. 84.

Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center

- 2009 File SGID_U024_Davis Parcels.shp, dated April 2009.

Utah Division of Water Resources

- 2013 Water-Related Land Use Map for all Agricultural Areas.
- 2015 2015 file SGID93.PLANNING.WaterRelatedLandUse downloaded from Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center, State Geographic Information Database (SGID) Server, from Barbara Perry, Utah Division of Water Resources. Data collected and current as of 2013.

Utah Farm Bureau Federation

- 2011 Comments on the Environmental Impact Statement for West Davis Corridor. March 22.
- 2014 Utah Century Farms and Ranches. ag.utah.gov/licenses-registrations/41-licenses-regulations-and-registration/201-century-farm-registration.html. Accessed February 27, 2014.

Weber County

- 2010 Weber County – Weber County Planning GIS data, filename HooperCity_APA_Scans_20100610.pdf, dated June 10.

West Davis Corridor Team

- 2010 West Davis Corridor Summary Scoping Report.