

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Ram Logging on Gallik Limited Partnership, Edward Gallik

Proposed Implementation Date: February 19, 2008

Proponent: Raymond Mann of Mann Logging

Type and Purpose of Action: Allow equipment operation in SMZ to cross a Class 2 stream on a temporary road and haullogs to an existing road. A log bridge will be installed at the crossing site and distance traveled through the SMZ will be minimized. Logs will be removed upon completion and the site will be rehabilitated as necessary.

Location: Lot 4 Section 34, Township 13N, Range 9W

County: Lewis & Clark

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	This is on Private land and no public involvement is necessary other than DNRC
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	None
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	No action Install culvert or permanent crossing; build road.
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, compactable 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] None identified

RECEIVED

MAR 29 2008

LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
POLICY OFFICE

<p>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?</p> <p>Would the Alternative Practice conserve the integrity of the SMZ, and these specific functions?</p> <p>Ability to act as an effective sediment filter.</p> <p>Ability to provide shade to regulate stream temperature.</p> <p>Protection of stream channel and banks.</p> <p>Ability to provide large, woody debris for eventual recruitment into the stream to maintain riffles pools and other elements of channel structure.</p> <p>Promotes floodplain stability.</p> <p>Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p>	<p>[Y] The integrity of the SMZ will be conserved through the mitigation measures identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limited harvest will protect the ability of the SMZ to act as an effective filter, provide shade, protect banks, provide large woody debris and promote flood plain stability; sub-merchantable trees and shrubs will be protected in accordance with the law. • Installation of a log bridge crossing will protect the bed and banks of the stream and when removed will return the channel to its original state. • This is a salvage operation to remove beetle killed Lodgepole Pine. Other species are present and will be retained to meet the requirements of the SMZ Law & Rules. • This operation will be conducted under winter conditions with frozen ground and adequate snow cover to minimize disturbance. <p>[N] Cumulative impacts are not likely to occur. This is a salvage operation. Dead or dying trees will be harvested and live trees retained.</p>
<p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I air shed)? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>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?</p> <p>Would the SMZ retain the Ability to support diverse and productive aquatic and terrestrial habitats?</p>	<p>[N]</p> <p>[Y] The limited harvest in the SMZ should have no impacts on the ability of the SMZ to support wildlife.</p>
<p>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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p>	<p>[N] None identified</p>
<p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>[N]</p>

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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
13. 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
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?	[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] This project will increase revenue for the landowner and extend employment for the operator. [N] No cumulative impacts are expected.
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] The increased revenue to the landowner and extended employment of the operator should have a corresponding increase in state and local tax revenue.
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] This action should actually decrease the need for fire protection services by reducing the hazard.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] None identified
19. 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] This is private land and recreational activities on the land are at the owner's discretion. The project will not hinder other activities on adjacent public lands.
20.	

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 timber management? Is future use hypothetical? What is the estimated return to the trust? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
EA Checklist Prepared By Name: <u>Norman Fortunate</u> Title: <u>Service Forester</u> Date: <u>February 14, 2008</u>	
IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED: Grant the Alternative Practice.	
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:

Steve Wallace

Clearwater Unit Manager

Name

Title

Signature

Date

Steve Wallace 2/19/08