

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Jack Piippo HRA# 32-B-37108 Proposed Implementation Date: June 19th 2006

Proponent: Levi Cheff Operator

DNRC - Trust Land Management Division

Type and Purpose of Action: To allow equipment operation in the SMZ in order to salvage dead or dying trees and remove hazard trees from a residential lot along the Clearwater River. To remove most of the Lodgepole Pine in order to reduce bark beetle infestation and salvage dead or dying trees; this action will most likely reduce the number of trees in the SMZ below the retention tree standards set in the SMZ Rules. This action is necessary to provide operator safety and protect the safety and property of the owner and guests.

Location: Lot 208d Double Arrow Ranch Phase 1A; SE1/4 Section 10, Township 16 North, Range 15 West

County: Missoula

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology the scoping and ongoing involvement for this Project.	This is private property and only the DNRC and other agencies with jurisdiction have been involved.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	None
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	No Action,
II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES 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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] RECEIVED JUN 30 2006 LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY OFFICE
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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? Is it possible that implementing this Alternative Practice would impact the integrity of the SMZ and these specific functions? Ability to act as an effective sediment filter. Ability to provide shade to regulate stream temperature. Protection of stream channel and banks. Ability to provide large woody debris for eventual recruitment into the stream to maintain riffles, pools and other elements of channel stability. Promotes floodplain stability.	[Y] This is a private residence along the Clearwater River. The site is used for residences and recreation, such as boating, swimming, fishing, family reunions and group camping. The impacts to the SMZ from this action are negligible. Grass and vegetation are present to act as a filter and protect bank stability. The trees being removed are dead or dying and are hazard trees to the landowner's property and guests. In as much as this is residential and recreational property and used as such (either summer time or year-round) other measures are in place to protect the integrity of the stream channel and banks. The operator and landowner plan to replant the SMZ with other trees suitable to the site to promote long term stability of the stream.

	[N]
--	-----

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? Would implementing this Alternative Practice impact the ability of the SMZ to support diverse and productive aquatic and terrestrial habitats?	[N]
9. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N]
10. 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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
11. 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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
12. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of other private, state or federal current actions w/n the analysis area, or from future proposed state actions that are under MEPA review (scoping) or permitting review by any state agency w/n the analysis area?	[N]

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
13. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] This project will reduce safety risks to the resident and guests by removing hazard trees.
14. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N]

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] Although this project is small it will add some employment and revenue to the local economy slightly
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] Again as this project is very small it will add slightly to the tax revenue as a result of additional income to operator and landowner as well as add additional log supply to the local mills.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] These sites are already used for private recreational purposes. Due to the small size and nature of this project, no cumulative impacts are expected.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[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: Is there a potential for other future uses for easement area other than for management? Is future use hypothetical? What estimated return to the trust. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]

EA Checklist Prepared By: Norm Fortunate Service Forester June 19th 2006
Name Title Date

IV. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Approve proposed action
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	None
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: Eric Norris Lead Service Forester
Name Title

Signature: *Eric Norris* Date: 6/19/06