

Dreg Hall RECEIVED
 SEP 28 1992
 ENVIRONMENTAL
 QUALITY COUNCIL

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name Emmons Creek gravel permit Implementation date July, 1992
 Proponent Flathead National Forest, Swan Lake District
 Type and Purpose of Action Develop gravel pit on state land to crush approximately 13,870 tons of gravel
 Location NW~~NE~~SE~~E~~ Section 36, T27N, R22W County Flathead

N = Not present or No Impact will occur
 Y = Impacts may occur (explain under Potential Impacts)

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	[N] The site is on the crest of a ridge where USFS Road #2991 is located. The site is an area of broken loose weathered rock, mixed with some poor quality soil and organic matter. There is very little vegetation on the site.
2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present?	[N] There are no water sources in the area of proposed action. The gravel pit area is on the crest of a ridge that is covered with weathered rock and little vegetation.
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N] The proposed action is outside a Class I air shed area. The dust created by blasting and the crusher should not travel far or influence the overall air quality.
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N] The proposed site is mostly barren except for a few native grasses, lichen and moss. There were not any rare plants identified.
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there significant use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] There is not any significant use of the proposed site by wildlife or birds. The site is adjacent to USFS Road #2991 and to an old clearcut unit, so there is little cover or vegetation that would be of importance. An occasional animal may cross the site in traveling from one location to another.
6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?	[N] The proposed site is not a known site for habitation or use by any T & E species. No nesting sites or T & E animals have been observed on or near the site.
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] See Attached archaeological report.
8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas?	[Y] The site is on a ridge and the shape of the ridge will be altered by the action. The site will have a lower elevation after the gravel is removed, but will be visible only when passing by while traveling on USFS Road #2991. The site will be reclaimed with backslopes, overburden spread out and reseeded with grass. (The site is not visible from populated or scenic areas.)
9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area?	[N] N/A

10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:	[Y] This state parcel is part of a land exchange with the Flathead National Forest. This action will not have any impact on the pending land exchange as the Flathead National Forest is the agency that has requested the gravel.
IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[Y] The project is adjacent to USFS Road #2991. Proper warning signs and flag personnel will be on the road for trucks entering or turning and during blasting operations.
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N] N/A
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs?	[Y] The project is to provide gravel for resurfacing some USFS roads in the area. This overall project will create a short boost of employment for up to ten people.
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N] This project will have no affect on tax revenue.
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will significant traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	[N] N/A
15. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] N/A
17. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	[N] This general area is not used for concentrated recreational use. The area is used for hunting, gopher shooting, general recreational driving in automobiles and trucks or on bikes, motorbikes or ATVs. This use is not heavy and this action would have limited impact on these activities. A person may be delayed for safety reasons, but would still be able to use the general area.
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N] N/A
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N] N/A
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N] After the action has taken place, the site will be lower in elevation and have cut sides, but the reclamation plan calls for redistributing of the overburden, back sloping pit sides and reseeding the area with grass. There was not anything unique about the site, but the reclamation action will return it somewhat to original condition.
21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N] N/A

22. Alternatives Considered (if any) There are two alternatives:

- 1) No action, and
- 2) Do the proposed action. No action was not considered because the location is the only close source of rock to be crushed for the road resurface project. Also, no action would have caused a loss of the revenue to the trust funds, plus may have increased the cost of the FS project.

23. Public Involvement, Agencies, Groups or Individuals contacted The project location is a remote site and is of minor magnitude. The Flathead National Forest and their resources have had inputs as has Dori Passmann for archaeological study. This is part of a FS resurface project of their main road system in the area.

24. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction, List of Permits Needed, and Agencies or Groups Contacted or Contributing Information.

There are no other permits required for this action.

25. Significance of Potential Impacts None

[] Check if Additional Pages are Attached

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

- [] EIS
- [] More Detailed EA
- [] No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By: William F. Wright Title: Kalispell Unit Manager

Office or Bureau: Field Operations, Northwestern Land Office, Kalispell Unit

Signature of Preparer: William F. Wright August 20, 1992
(Date)

Reviewed By: Ed J. Tress 8 Sept. 92 Manager Forestry & Handls Progs
name DATE title NWLO

signature

Area Manager

Approved By: William E. O'Brien Northwestern Land Office
name title

William EO Brien

signature

9 September, 1992

(Date)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS



STAN STEPHENS, GOVERNOR

CAPITOL STATION

STATE OF MONTANA

(406) 444-2074

1625 ELEVENTH AVENUE
HELENA, MONTANA 59620

February 5, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Wright, Kalispell Unit Manager, NWLO

FROM: Dori Passmann, Archaeologist, Land Management Section *CP*

RE: Emmons Creek Quarry
SE/4 36-27N-22W

There are no known sites in the permit area. Significant cultural properties are unlikely on steep slopes. This project does not require further cultural consideration.

Please let me know if I can be of additional assistance.

/ns

