

## CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Project Name:** Section 24 Timber Permit  
**Proposed Implementation Date:** January 1, 2011  
**Proponent:** State of Montana - DNRC  
**Location:** NW1/4 Sec 24 T11N R20W  
**County:** Missoula

### I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The DNRC proposes to harvest approximately 110 thousand board feet (MBF) of timber from approximately 40 acres on the sections described below. Harvest operations would be designed to salvage ponderosa pine trees blown down in the spring of 2010 and lightly thin the surrounding stands to remove the least healthy trees and improve growing space for the residual stands. The proposed activities would take place between January 1st and January 31<sup>st</sup> of 2011 while soils are frozen and snows covered. The purpose of these management activities would be to: 1.) Generate revenue for the University School Trust; 2.) Reduce the risk of a pine beetle infestation by removing the blowdown food source and the most susceptible trees. 3.) Manage the identified parcels for healthy and biologically diverse forests.

### II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

#### 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

*Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.*

Mike McGrath, DNRC Wildlife Biologist; Paul Moore, DNRC Hamilton Unit Manager; Jeff Collins, DNRC, Hydrologist/Soil Scientist; adjacent large land owners to the project area; Mark Reiling of Sapphire Ranch and Tom Maclay, Maclay Ranch, John Ottman, Ottman Forestry Services.

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

None

#### 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No Action Alternative - Under this alternative, the salvage of approximately 10 MBF of wind damaged timber and an additional harvest of approximately 100 MBF on approximately 40 acres within the NW1/4 of section 24 would not take place and the potential for an increase of mountain pine beetle and mortality within the stand may occur.

Action Alternative - This action alternative would remove approximately 10 MBF of wind damaged timber and an additional 100 MBF would receive a light improvement harvest to remove the poorest trees and those trees with the highest risk for mortality in the future. This would involve the removal of approximately 110 MBF from approximately 40 acres and would involve no new road construction.

### 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.*

The soils are a complex of Riverun/Gash series stratified coarse sands and sandy gravels with shallow topsoils forming in alluvial and floodplain deposits of the Bitterroot River with moderate erosivity. The topography is

primarily flat with small undulations adjacent to the Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek and overflow channels found in the analysis area. There is no especially unique or unstable terrain on the project site.

The risk of harvest impacts from disturbance in the form of erosion, displacement, and compaction would be low, due to proposed harvesting and hauling operations limited to winter operations of frozen, or snow covered ground. DNRC soil monitoring on previous projects has confirmed that very low disturbance or erosion occurred with winter harvest operations. Woods defect and large unmerchantable pieces of trees would be left in the woods as well as tree tops up to 5 inches in diameter to provide coarse woody debris (CWD) for moisture retention and nutrient recycling. Additionally, some blown down trees would be left in the SMZ on for the same purpose and other blowdown sustained on these sections but outside the project area would also be left. No new road construction or excavation is proposed in the floodplain. Road use would require some blading of the surface to remove snow and ruts with an emphasis on filling with snow/ice, and no soil filling or excavation is proposed in the floodplain. Approximately 200 feet of the existing road parallels Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek and is less than 50 feet from the stream. All roads will be grass seeded after use. There is low risk of direct, in-direct or cumulative effects to soil based on BMP implementation and operations limited to winter conditions.

#### **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.*

The project area is located on alluvial terrace within the 100 yr floodplain between the Bitterroot River and Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek that parallels the river. The general area contains several relict overflow channels and meander features that may be active during flood events, but do not meet the definitions of streams contained in the Montana Streamside Management Law and Rules. No harvest operations are planned near the Bitterroot River. Forest management is an allowed use within the floodplain, without permit requirement (36.15.601) provided there is no filling or new structures proposed. Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek has continuous stream flow and is a Class 1 stream that flows along the western edge of the proposed harvest (see map). McClain Creek is a tributary to Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek. McClain Creek is 303d listed as partially supporting aquatic life and fish habitat due to a poorly constructed road in the headwaters that contributes sediment to the stream, about 3 miles east of the DNRC project site.

The proposed blowdown salvage, harvest and thinning area is located on the higher terrace sites that are relatively dry, and not occupied by wetland vegetation. However, several depressions and low spots adjacent to the harvest unit are occupied by cottonwood, aspen, dogwood and grass vegetation communities. These areas would be considered as isolated or adjacent wetlands and protected by establishing Wetland Management Zones to restrict operations and avoid disturbance adjacent to wetland sites. A limited number of blowdown trees (approximately 8-12 trees) are within the SMZ of Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek. Due to the gentle topography of this area, the required minimum SMZ distances are 50' except where the SMZ would be extended to incorporate any adjacent wetland areas. No ground based equipment harvest is planned in the SMZ locations and blowdown lying within the SMZ would be removed by cable winching from outside of the SMZ. An adjacent Riparian Management Zone (RMZ) extends protective restrictions an additional 30 ft (a total 80 ft from Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek) and in the 50-80 ft RMZ equipment operations are restricted to winter or dry conditions. Several trees have actually fallen within or across the stream channel itself and would be left as CWD and recruitment to the stream. The proposed selective removal of the trees lying within the SMZ presents low risk of impacts to water quality or channel stability. The bulk of the 40 acre harvest is away from Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek and the salvage of up to 12 trees within the SMZ/RMZ would not measurably affect tree shading, stream temperature or recruitable large woody debris of Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek.

Road use-The proposed haul route would use an existing road from HWY 93 that crosses private land and uses an existing crossing of Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek. The existing crossing is in poor condition due to age and the culverts will not last much longer, but is not a direct sediment source and the purchaser is responsible for R/W access and use of the crossing. Hauling operations would be limited to frozen or snow covered conditions to prevent rutting disturbance and sedimentation. The limited use of the existing crossing (20-25 truck loads) and proposed harvest in winter for the DNRC permit harvest would not be expected to impact downstream water quality.

The existing access road parallels Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek, and is within 50 ft. for a length of about 300 ft on flat terrain in DNRC section 24.

On the road segment where the existing road is within 50 ft of the creek, no harvest is proposed between the existing road and Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek. Harvest of up to 12 dead and high risk trees is proposed within the 50 ft SMZ and portion of RMZ that is on the opposite side of the existing road away from Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek. In summary, all BMP's, and requirements for SMZ's, RMZ's and WMZ's would be applied and administered during harvest operations. No road reconstruction is proposed and there would be low risk of disturbance or off-site erosion as a result of the use of existing road for access and log hauling, during the winter. Based on the harvest design and winter conditions, there is low risk of direct, indirect or cumulative effects to water quality or downstream beneficial uses.

#### **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.*

The slash from the harvested trees not left in the woods for nutrient recycling and CWD would be burned and would produce some smoke. This burning would be subject to air quality restrictions within the Missoula Air shed and all burning would be conducted under good dispersion and coordinated through the Montana Air Shed Group to protect air quality. No cumulative impacts would be expected to occur.

#### **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.**

Background: No rare plants or cover types have been identified on the project area. These stands lie on the Bitterroot River bottom and are composed of 100% ponderosa pine (PP). They are primarily even-aged (90-100 years old) stands with very little second growth in openings. The PP are generally found on the small terraces and upland ground while most of the lowlands and slough areas are inhabited by deciduous vegetation such as willows, dogwood, cottonwoods, and aspen. The stands have moderate to high stocking levels with diameters averaging 13-22 inches. Overall stand health is moderate to good. Some areas have received high amounts of porcupine damage in the past resulting in multiple tops and other physical deformities. Elytroderma, needle blight, is infecting some of the trees as well as Mountain Pine Beetle

The intent of the proposal is to remove blown down trees sustained from high winds in the spring of 2010 and thin residual trees to improve stand health and vigor. Bark beetle populations are currently at increased levels and the stands are at high risk for invasion. The need for the proposed action is compounded by the blowdown here and on adjacent private lands. Removal of the blown down trees would minimize the risk of beetle populations building in the area with the removal of this downed food source. Thinning the residual stand should also decrease the risk of beetle attacks to the existing stand by improving individual tree health and growth. This would primarily be a thin-from-below harvest designed to remove those suppressed, intermediate, and some codominant trees that have poor form, poor crowns, and are less vigorous. Basal area removals of approximately 10-30% of the standing trees would be expected with a majority of the acreage treated falling in the lower range of this basal area removal. A majority of the trees designated for harvest would be from the smaller size classes; however some larger trees that have poor form, vigor, or are overcrowded would be removed as well.

The target stand would have larger average diameters, lower stocking levels, and more growing space available for the residual stand. The proposed activities would not preclude any desired future management direction by maintaining the stands in healthy and biologically diverse conditions.

Knapweed and leafy spurge can be found on State section 24 and adjacent ownerships. These non-native noxious weeds do have negative effects on native species by competing for growing space. The DNRC released leafy spurge flea beetles (*Aphthona Lacertosa*) in the summers of 1999, 2000, 2001 and in 2005 an additional 60,000 spurge flea beetles were released as a control measure. Weed control on this state ownership is currently assigned to the grazing lessee. To limit the spread of weeds under the proposed action, all harvest equipment would be cleaned of mud and weed seed to prevent the introduction of noxious weeds, and would be inspected by the DNRC. Also, management activities would take place in the month of January when the weeds are dormant and the ground would likely be frozen and/or snow covered. Therefore, ground

disturbance would be minimized. The project area is currently being monitored annually for new weed infestations and this activity will continue. If new species of weeds are noted, a weed management plan would be developed and implemented and coordinated with lessee efforts.

The no action alternative would result in a high risk of pine beetle infestation of the area due to the readily available blown down food source and the good probability of spread into the residual stands and on to adjacent properties, and mortality of live trees in the area would be expected. Without thinning, the residual stands would be less vigorous, more susceptible to insects and disease. As a result, stands would have poorer health and vigor and a moderate to high risk of loss.

## **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.*

The proposed timber permit would harvest approximately 10 MBF of wind thrown Ponderosa pine, and approximately 100 MBF of standing timber through an individual tree selection harvest within the northwest ¼ of section 24 T11N R20W. The proposed harvest would also include removing conifers internal to aspen clones and within a 50-foot radius of the clones to improve aspen health and spur regeneration.

Required habitat characteristics for Canada lynx, grizzly bears, peregrine falcons, fishers, black-backed woodpeckers, Townsend's big-eared bat, Coeur d'Alene salamander, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, common loon, northern bog lemming, and mountain plover are not present within a 1-mile radius of the affected stands. Thus, no direct, indirect, or cumulative negative effects are likely to result from the proposed action for these species, and will not be considered further in the analysis.

**Gray Wolf (federally experimental)**—The Welcome Creek wolf pack is known to occur within 4 miles east of the project area. Primary considerations are that habitats could be made less effective for prey needed by wolves (primarily deer and elk), and the location of den and rendezvous sites. Minor adverse effects are possible for local elk and deer that use the project area, due to increased sight distance and use of the area by archers during hunting season. The affected parcel is bordered along its south and west boundaries by developed subdivision, and thus, discharge of a firearm within 0.25 mile of those borders would be prohibited (ARM 36.25.149 1(c)). Therefore, the threat of any cumulative impacts to elk and deer populations in the area is relatively small. **Recommended Mitigations:** 1) suspension of operations and temporary restriction of use of roads within a 1-mile radius of any known active wolf den until the wolves have vacated the site, a DNRC Biologist has approved re-commencing project activity (pursuant to ARM 36.11.431 (1)(a)(i)); and 2) temporarily suspend operations if a suspected rendezvous site is observed within 0.5 mile of on-going mechanized activities until a DNRC Biologist determines that resumption of activities will not present conflicts with wolf use (pursuant to ARM 36.11.431 (1)(a)(ii)). With implementation of the proposed mitigations, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to gray wolves from the proposed action.

**Bald Eagle**—The Schroeder bald eagle territory is located within and adjacent to the project area. The territory includes 4 nest sites, with one nest occurring in the northeast quarter of the affected parcel. As such, the proposed action would occur between August 16 and January 31 to reduce impacts from mechanized activity on the territory during the breeding season (pursuant to ARM 36.111.429 (1)(d)(i)). Through the proposed implementation of an individual tree selection harvest, the proposed action would maintain structural and ecological characteristics pertaining to the territory's primary use area (e.g., ample stocking, large emergent trees, snags, etc.; pursuant to ARM 36.111.429 (1)(d)(i)(C)(III)(ii)). Through implementation of these mitigations, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to this bald eagle territory from the proposed action.

**Flammulated Owl**—Flammulated owl habitat occurs throughout the project area (Stand Level Inventory Database). The proposed action would directly affect flammulated owl preferred habitat types. Currently, the affected acres consist of a mixture of Ponderosa pine, aspen, and cottonwood in the overstory. Through the proposed reduction in standing volume by approximately 115 to 120 MBF, canopy gaps would be created, permitting some forest regeneration to occur. As a result, there may be some slight improvements in flammulated owl habitat post-harvest. Thus, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to flammulated owls from the proposed action.

**Pileated Woodpeckers**—Habitats usable by pileated woodpeckers occur within the project area. Pileateds prefer mature conifer forest with a canopy dominated by large western larch or ponderosa pine. Pileated woodpeckers typically do not nest in trees less than 15 inches dbh, and sufficient large snags and coarse woody debris are important components of pileated woodpecker habitat. Salvage activities, such as those proposed in the harvest alternative, would remove snag and coarse woody debris recruits. Some individuals may be temporarily displaced during timber harvest activities. Recommended Mitigations: 1) retain ponderosa pine snags and snag recruits in the largest diameter classes available (pursuant to ARM 36.11.411 and 36.11.413); 2) retain all snags of all diameter classes that do not pose unacceptable risks to human safety; 3) retain adequate amounts of coarse woody debris (pursuant to ARM 36.11.414); 4) retain majority of >15 inch dbh Ponderosa pine. Through implementation of these mitigations, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to pileated woodpeckers from the proposed action.

**Harlequin Duck**—Harlequin ducks nest along rapidly moving streams. Because the affected parcel includes the Bitterroot River, it would be possible that this species could utilize this parcel. However, the proposed action would not harvest in or near the riparian area of the Bitterroot River, and adequate buffers would be left to allow for sediment filtration, there would be low risk of direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to harlequin ducks as a result of the proposed action.

**White-tailed Deer**—White-tailed deer utilize the project area throughout the year, in addition to winter range. The proposed action would harvest approximately 125 MBF from the northwest quarter of the affected parcel, largely through individual tree selection harvest. As a result, there would be some reduction in snow-intercept cover on approximately 160 acres, while the remaining 480 acres of the affected parcel would remain unharvested. Thus, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to this species from the proposed action.

#### **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.*

**Fisheries** - The Bitterroot River flows through the east half of DNRC section 24 and the river supports a cold water fishery that includes both bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout. Bull trout are currently listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act and westslope cutthroat trout is a sensitive species. No harvest or road use is planned near the Bitterroot River. Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek flows along the western boundary of DNRC section 24 and may provide use for westslope cutthroat trout and possibly bull trout during portions of the year when flows are moderate to high.

The proposed haul route would use an existing crossing of Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek and follow an old road location. Up to 15 trees would be removed from the Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek SMZ/RMZ during winter conditions as described in the water quality section. The bulk of the 40 acre harvest is away from Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek and the minor salvage within the SMZ/RMZ would not measurably affect fish habitat, including; sedimentation, tree shading, stream temperature or recruitable large woody debris of Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek. No road reconstruction is proposed and the limited use of the existing crossing (25 truck loads) and proposed harvest in winter would not be expected to impact downstream fish habitat or water quality. The proposed permit harvest for forest management would meet interim guidelines developed by the Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team in the Bull Trout Immediate Actions and the State's draft Bull Trout Restoration Plan, and Watershed, Fisheries and Threatened and Endangered Species Resource Management Standards contained in the State Forest Land Management Plan. Based on the harvest design and winter conditions, there is low risk of direct, indirect or cumulative effects to fish habitat.

Wetlands occur on low spots and along old overflow channels within the section located near Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek and along the eastern harvest unit boundary. Wetland management zones would be maintained along the eastern harvest boundary where wetland vegetation and some areas of saturated soil are indicated. The SMZ/RMZ/WMZ protective requirements would apply to all of these areas and the SMZ of Sin-tin-tin-em-ska Creek would be protected accordingly. There would be low risk of direct, indirect or cumulative impacts occurring to these species and wetland areas as a result of the proposed action.

**10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:**

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

None of these sites were identified.

**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.*

The proposed project area is located ½ mile east of Highway 93 between Lolo and Florence, MT on flat ground and is not easily visible from populated areas. The proposed activities are not likely to be visually noticeable from the highway. The closest residence to the project area is located approximately 1100 feet from the proposed harvest area and log hauling would be visible from this residence. During harvest operations from 1/1 - 1/31 some noise and light from harvest activities would be expected but should not be excessive in nature. No cumulative impacts are likely to occur to aesthetics as a result of the proposed action.

**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.*

A timber salvage project is planned adjacent to State section 24 this winter on private land located within the sw¼, sw¼ of section 13 T11N,R20W. This activity will remove damage trees and lightly thin the remaining stand over approximately 25 acres. The landowner is working with natural resource managers from the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. No cumulative impacts are likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

**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.*

Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Checklist Environmental Assessment, McLain Creek Thinning Project, 2009.

Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Checklist Environmental Assessment, Glass Bridge Permits, January 1999.

**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.*

All operations would provide for public safety. Any unauthorized person nearing the project area while management activities are in progress would be warned as soon as possible of the safety hazards and would be asked to stay clear of the area.

**15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:**

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

No impacts

**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.*

People are currently employed in the wood products industry in the region. Due to the relatively small size of the timber sale, there would be no measurable cumulative impact from this proposed action on employment.

**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.*

No impacts

**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*

There would be no measurable cumulative impacts related to demand for government services due to the relatively small size of the timber permit, the short-term impacts to traffic, and the small possibility of a few people temporarily relocating to the area.

**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.*

In June 1996, DNRC began a phased-in implementation of the State Forest Land Management Plan (Plan). The management direction provided in the Plan comprises the framework within which specific project planning and activities take place. The Plan philosophy and appropriate Resource Management Standards have been incorporated into the design of the proposed action.

**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.*

All of State section 24 is inaccessible to the public without permission from an adjacent landowner unless access is gained from the Bitterroot River and its associated ordinary high water mark. Some archery hunting of whitetail deer on the project area does take place by means of these access methods. However, very little of the project area is legally easily accessible to the public. The area is likely used for hiking, hunting, or other recreation by adjacent landowners as well. The timing and light nature of the proposed activities described in #7 are not likely to negatively impact the recreational opportunities on the project area and cumulative impacts are not expected

**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.*

No impact

**22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:**

*Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.*

No impact

**23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:**

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

No impact

**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.*

Minimum expected return: (110 MBF) (7.00 tons/MBF) = 770 tons X (\$10.00/T minimum stumpage bid) = \$7,700 + \$3,444.10 in Forest Improvement Fees. No action would result in loss of income to the University School Trust.

<b>EA Checklist Prepared By:</b>	<b>Name:</b> Paul Moore	<b>Date:</b> 12-15-2010
	<b>Title:</b> DNRC, Hamilton Unit Manager	

**V. FINDING**

**25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:**

I find that the environmental assessment (EA) checklist is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action. All resources and environmental values pertaining to the proposed action have been properly identified and thoroughly evaluated. The harvest of this timber, in my opinion, will pose no environmental risks. Therefore I select the action alternative.

**26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:**

No impact

**27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

EIS                     
 More Detailed EA                     
 No Further Analysis

<b>EA Checklist Approved By:</b>	<b>Name:</b> Jon M. Hayes
	<b>Title:</b> Area Silviculturist, Southwestern Land Office
<b>Signature:</b>	<b>Date:</b> December 28, 2010

- Attachments:  
Attachment A Vicinity Map  
Attachment B Project Area Map