

RECEIVED

DEC 15 1992

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL

Project Name GUIDEBANK IN RIVER Proposed Implementation Date: ?
 Proponent MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 Type and Purpose of Action DOT WISHES TO BUILD A "GUIDEBANK" TO DIVERT FLOOD WATERS AROUND AN ABUTMENT ON INTERSTATE 90. THE GUIDEBANK IS TO BE BUILT IN CONJUNCTION WITH A "SPUR". DESIGN IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL STANDARDS ACCORDING TO LESSLEY TRIBELHORN OF DOT'S HYDRAULICS.

Location SEC. 19, TIN-R4E County GALLATIN

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?	[Y] RIVER BANK SOILS ARE UNSTABLE - PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO BE PART OF A STABILIZATION PROGRAM TO PREVENT SCOURING BEHIND BRIDGE ABUTMENT ON INTERSTATE 90.
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 contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?	[Y] PROJECT WILL HAVE AN IMPACT ON WATER QUALITY IN WEST FORK OF THE GALLATIN RIVER. AN ISLAND WILL BE EXCAVATED TO PROVIDE A CHANNEL TO REPLACE THAT TAKEN BY THE GUIDEBANK.
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?	[N]
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there significant use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[Y] WEST GALLATIN RIVER IS AN IMPORTANT FISHERY.
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]
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?	[Y] PROJECT WILL BE VISIBLE FROM EAST BOUND LANE OF I-90. IT WILL IMPACT THE AESTHETICS OF THE RIVER.
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?	[Y] AREA HAS BEEN SUBJECT OF NUMEROUS STUDIES, INCL. A CORPS OF ENGINEERS BANK STABILIZATION PROJECT.

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] PROJECT WILL MITIGATE THE POTENTIAL SAFETY RISK THAT WOULD OCCUR IF BRIDGE ABUTMENT WASHED OUT.
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N] PROJECT WILL MOST LIKELY PREVENT THE DISRUPTION THAT WOULD OCCUR IF ABUTMENT WASHED OUT.
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?	[Y] AREA IS USED YEAR ROUND BY FISHERMEN.
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 - COULD RESULT IN ABUTMENT BEING WASHED OUT - CREATING PUBLIC SAFETY HAZARD AND DISRUPTING FLOW OF TRAFFIC ON I-90.

23. Public Involvement, Agencies, Groups or Individuals contacted PROJECT IS AN EXTENSION OF A CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECT PROPOSAL IN 1990 THAT ALLOWED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. RIVERWATCH GROUP SHOULD BE CONTACTED BY DOT. DOT SHOULD HOLD ANOTHER PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING BECAUSE PROJECT IS CONSIDERABLY MORE INVOLVED THAN EARLIER REQUESTS.

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

WATER QUALITY BUREAU - WATER QUALITY PERMIT
CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CORPS PERMIT (404)
FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS - BID PERMIT (124)

25. Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts. THERE IS A CHANCE FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE. IT SHOULD BE DONE DURING LOW WATER. THE VARIOUS PERMITS REQUIRED SHOULD GENERATE THE NEED FOR A DETAILED PLAN TO MITIGATE IMPACTS ON WATER QUALITY. THIS SHOULD BE DONE BY DOT

GRANTING OF EASEMENT SHOULD BE CONDITIONAL ON DOT PROVIDING PROOF OF HAVING OBTAINED NECESSARY PERMITS.

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By: Jim Koltowski Title UNIT MANAGER
Approved By: MARK D. AHNER AREA MANAGER, ELO
name title

Mark D. Ahner
signature

* Done by DHES.