

DNRC - Trust Land Management Division

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Borman Pipeline 1
 Proposed Implementation Date: April 1, 2004
 Proponent: Circle B LLC c/o Frank Borman
 Type and Purpose of Action: Stockwater pipeline with tanks to achieve better livestock distribution
 Location: Section 36, T5N-R34E
 County: Treasure

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	Contact with lessee to discuss and review pipeline proposal.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	None
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	1. No action 2. Authorize pipeline

RECEIVED

MAR 16 2004

LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
POLICY OFFICE

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS
	N = Not Present or No Impact will occur. Y = Impacts may occur (explain below)
4. 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 pipeline route is adjacent to a 2-track trail system which runs through lowlands, across dry coulee's, and up-slope to high benchland.
5. 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?	[N] Upland, arid tract. The only dependable water source in this small, Petes Coulee, watershed appears to be at the well-site, where the pipeline is to originate, on deeded ground just west of the State tract.
6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N]
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N] Disturbance from pipeline construction is being revegetated with a compatible native seed mix.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] Mule deer and Pronghorn antelope, along with various non-game wildlife are common on the tract. The improved water distribution provided by this pipeline will benefit wildlife as well as livestock.
9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?	[N] This common arid, upland forest-grassland complex is approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the Yellowstone River. It is dominated by native grasses such as Western Wheatgrass and Bluebunch Wheatgrass, and an overstory of P-pine and junipers interspersed with shrubby draws.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] During an on-site visit in the fall of '03 nothing was found along the pipeline route. The overall tract has good potential however, with its vicinity to the Yellowstone River. Consultation with the Department Archaeologist revealed no recorded finds.
11. 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] This tract lies in rugged hill-type country, approximately 1 mile southeast of the Bighorn interchange on I-94. There's some nice scenery on this tract especially from the higher locales in the SE and along the northern bench.
12. 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] This water distribution project should have positive impacts on the overall resources of the area. Distribution of water to the uplands should alleviate grazing pressure in the lowlands and more evenly spread it to areas in need of it. Water tanks have been designed wildlife friendly.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	[N]

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N]

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[Y] This project will benefit the ranching operation by providing water to areas of the landscape which previously were without, making more forage available.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number:	[N]
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N]
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	[N]
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N]
20. 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 is a landlocked tract. Access to it is through approximately 1 mile of deeded ground from the Bighorn interchange on Interstate 94 up Petes Coulee. If not for the access issue, recreation potential could be considered high for any number of endeavors including hunting, hiking, riding and camping.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N]
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N]
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N]
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Authorize pipeline
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	<p>The disturbances from the pipeline installation are short-term, depending on revegetation success. The Land Use License will address this pipeline reclamation with the possibility of license revocation if reclamation is not successful.</p> <p>Improved water distribution will affect the overall resource in a positive way by making water more available to both livestock and wildlife, and by alleviating pressure in the lowland areas. This should have a positive influence on shrub health, and overall wildlife habitats.</p>
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:	
<input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By:

Sharon Moore
Name

Area Manager
Title

Sharon Moore
Signature

2/18/04
Date