

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Horning ROW
Proposed Implementation Date:	Spring 2006
Proponent:	Dave Horning
Location:	Section 16 T.11N. R.2W.
County:	Lewis & Clark

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Dave Horning proposes to obtain an easement for a road to access private property. The proposal would involve State land in section 16 T.11N. R.2W. near Dana's Point northeast of Helena Montana. The easement would utilize an existing road with some minor realignment and extension of approximately 200' to reach the private land of the proponent.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:
Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

The state's lessee and adjacent homeowner's association were contacted.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:
 NA

RECEIVED

MAY 04 2006

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:
 1. Issuing the easement as proposed.
 2. Not issuing the easement

LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
 POLICY OFFICE

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:
Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

None. The majority of the easement would be located on an existing road. Some minor reconstruction would be done to improve grade and alignment and the existing road would be extended for approximately 200' to the property line. The area involved in new construction has been previously mined hydraulically in the early part of the century. The proposed grade and alignment would limit washing and drainage problems.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:
Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

None. No surface water resources are on the tract and no ground water impacts are expected.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

None. No class 1 zones would be impacted. A minor amount of dust could be expected during construction but the small nature of the project would limit impact.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

None. No rare plants or cover types were observed on the area involved. The entire easement area has been previously disturbed. Some minimal disturbance would occur but reseeding would minimize impact.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

None. Mule deer frequent the area however the small size of the project would limit any impact.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

None. Some Bald Eagle use is present in the general area. No nest sites were observed during an on site inspection. No impacts are expected.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

None. No sites are listed and no resources were observed.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

None. Terrain and the location limit the visibility of the project from the lake and adjacent private land. A small portion of the project would be visible from Dana Point road at the junction.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

None. The small scope of the project limits any impacts.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

None. The tract is currently leased for grazing. The grazing lessee is proposing to eventually fence the area involved in the proposed project. Impacts would be mitigated by requiring the proponent to install gates in fencing to reduce conflict.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- *RESOURCES* potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain **POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS** following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

None.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

None.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

None.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

None.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

None. The small scale of the project would limit impact.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

None.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

None. The tract is currently accessible from the Dana Point rd.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

None.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

None.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

None.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

Return to the trust would be \$650.00/a. per the fee schedule. No impacts are expected.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Robert Vlahovich	Date: 1/4/06
	Title: Spec. Uses coord.	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Discussions initializing this request began approximately at the time that our internal moratorium was placed on the acceptance of easement applications. The proponent is aware that the policy on easements is under current review, and that his application will need to comply with the new policy once set by the Land Board. The project has been reviewed and would meet the previous policy conditions for issuance, as well as the current draft policy which is under review. To facilitate construction in a timely manner, coordinated with the construction on the adjacent private land, the proponent has requested and applied for a Land Use License for construction. This action would occur on the same route. A license provision requiring obliteration of the route, should policy change render issuance of the easement unacceptable, will be included.

I have selected the alternative to issue the LUL, and recommend the issuance of the easement.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

Easement stipulations will limit potential impacts. In addition to standard stipulations a special stipulation to address potential conflict with the current grazing use will be included; Grantee will be responsible to provide, install and maintain gates acceptable to the grazing lessee at ingress and egress points on the State land involved.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Darrel J. Bakken	
	Title: Helena Unit Manager	
Signature: /S/ Darrel J. Bakken		Date: 4/28/2006