RECEIVED
NOV 16 1992
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name Greany Range Renovation Proposed Implementation Date: 10/92
Proponent Richard Greany
Type and Purpose of Action The renovation of approximately 170 acres of land which was originally plowed and seeded in 1920. Over time the original seeding has deteriorated and is currently in poor condition. Mr. Greany wishes to renovate this worn out tame pasture.

Location N½ Sec. 30 T7N R8W County Powell

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]
2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminent levels, or degradation of water quality?	[N]
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N]
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[Y]
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there significant use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N]
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]
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] OK EXISTING DISTURBANCE (p)
8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	[N]
9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N]
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	[N]

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?	[N]
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[Y]
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so estimated number	[N]
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N]
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will significant traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	[N]
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N]
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]
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N]
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N]
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N]
21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]

22.Alternatives Considered No Action - This alternative will leave the tract in its current condition. Over time, the species composition will favor forbs and invader species until the native plants begin to invade the field and out-compete the introduced grasses and forbs. The potential for wind erosion will be less than if the proposed action is approved. The income to the School Trust will be greater with this alternative in year 1 and 2, equal in year 3, and less than the proposed action for the next 20 years.

ic Involvement, Agencies, Groups or Individuals contacted

1) Glen Green District Conservationist SCS Deer Lodge

2) Dori Passman DSL Archaeologist

3) Dick Greany Proponent

24. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction, List of Permits Needed.

None.

25. Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts.

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

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

EA Checklist Prepared By: Fred Staedler Title Anaconda Unit Manager

Approved By: Robert H. Storer Forests & Lands Program Mgr-SWLO

name title

Robert H. Storer 9/30/92

signature