

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Clagett Hill Slide Recovery
Proposed Implementation Date:	April, 2011
Proponent:	Scarsella Brothers, Inc., General Contractors
Location:	Township 23 North, Range 16 East ,Section 36: SW1/4, Lat 47.7148, Long-109.6262
County:	Fergus County
Trust:	Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The proponent is requesting a Land Use License (LUL) to remove soil and debris that slid onto, and is blocking the county road at Clagett Hill, and to place (waste) the material on adjacent state land. This action is necessary due to the land slide that occurred in the fall of 2010.

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 Montana Department of Resources and Conservation/ Trust Lands Management Division (DNRC/TLMD) – Northeastern Land Office (NELO), Montana Department of Transportation (MDOT), Fergus County Commissioners, Environmental Services, Fergus County Roads Department, and Highland Livestock Co. et al (Lease #473) are all involved with the proposed project.

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

No other governmental agencies have jurisdiction over this proposal.

Scarsella Brothers Inc. is responsible for acquiring any/all necessary state and federal permits to proceed with and complete the proposed project.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A (No Action) – Under this alternative, the DNRC does not issue a Land Use License to remove soil and debris that slid onto the county road at Clagett Hill and place (waste) the material on adjacent state land.

Alternative B (Proposed Action) – Under this alternative, the DNRC does issue a Land Use License to remove soil and debris that slid onto the county road at Clagett Hill and place (waste) the material on adjacent state land.

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.

There are no unusual geologic features in the proposed project area. The slide area is currently unstable. The proposed project will stabilize the slumped hillside and surrounding area.

Reclamation concerns, reseeding protocols and other mitigations are addressed in the Special Stipulations attached to the LUL.

No cumulative effects to the soils are anticipated.

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.

There are no surface water resources in the proposed project area.

No important groundwater resources are expected to be impacted.

No cumulative effects to the water resources are anticipated.

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.

Dirt work associated with removing debris to repair the slide will generate airborne dust. These activities will minimally affect air quality for a very limited amount of time.

No cumulative effects to air quality are anticipated.

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.

The proponent will be required by Special Stipulations to reseed the disturbed area in accordance with special provisions developed by Environmental Services, implemented by Fergus County Road Department and approved by DNRC.

The seed mix and seeding protocol are attached to the LUL in the Special Stipulations.

No rare plants or cover types are present.

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.

There will be some disturbance to wildlife associated with the slide repair, and removal of debris and dirt. This disturbance will be of short duration.

No cumulative effects to fish and wildlife are anticipated.

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.

The Species of Concern Report from the Montana Natural Heritage Program indicates that there are 6 species of concern that may occur in the project area: Black-tailed Prairie Dog (*Cynomys ludovicianus*), Great Blue Heron (*Ardea herodias*), Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), Townsend's Big-eared Bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), and Sharp-tailed Grouse (*Tympanuchus phasianellus*)

None of these species were found on the proposed project site during a field reviews conducted on March 29, and April 21, 2011 by the DNRC Land Use Specialist.

A review of the 2010 ArcGis Sage-grouse lek data indicated that there are no Sage-grouse leks within 10 miles of the proposed project site.

The proposed project area is minimal in size, so no cumulative effects to habitat are anticipated.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

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

Extensive historical, archeological and paleontological reviews and field inspections were conducted before the initial road construction was approved. No historical, archeological and paleontological resources were identified in the area of the proposed slide recovery area at that time.

Field inspections were conducted on March 29, and April 21, 2011, by a Northeastern Land Office Land Use Specialist. No historical, archeological or paleontological resources were identified.

Discovery of new historical, archeological or paleontological sites is addressed in the Special Stipulations attached to the permit.

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 state land does not provide any unique scenic qualities not also provided on adjacent private, and public lands. The proposed activity will be conducted in a remote area, so there would be no change to the aesthetics in either alternative.

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.

No demands on limited resources are required for this project.

No direct or cumulative effects to environmental resources are anticipated.

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.

There are no other projects or plans being considered on the tracts listed on this EA.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</i>• <i>Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</i>• <i>Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</i>

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

There are some human safety risks associated with the operation of heavy equipment. The proponent and their employees accept these risks.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

There will be no impact to industrial or commercial activities.

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.

The proposed activity will create a limited number of jobs. These positions are already held by employees of the proponent. No new jobs will be created.

No cumulative effects to the employment market are anticipated.

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.

There are no direct or cumulative effects to taxes or revenue for the proposed project.

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 will be no increases in traffic, no changes in traffic patterns, and no need for additional fire protection, or police services.

There will be no direct or cumulative effects on government services.

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.

There are no zoning or other agency management plans affecting these lands.

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.

The tract is adjacent to the Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River and the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument. The proposed removal of the land slide and the associated dirt work and reclamation will have no impact on these areas.

Access to the Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River will be improved when the slide is cleared and the Clagett Hill road is reopened.

No impacts to the recreational value are anticipated.

There will be no direct or cumulative effects on recreation or wilderness activities.

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

The proposal does not include any changes to housing or developments.

No direct or cumulative effects to population or housing are anticipated.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

There are no native, unique or traditional lifestyles or communities in the vicinity that would be impacted by the proposal.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

The proposed project will have no effect on any unique quality of the area.

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.

The Land Use License returns \$500 to the trust on this tract.

This is an emergency situation. The land slide has blocked the Clagett Hill road for several months. Access to the PN Bridge Campground and the Missouri River will be improved when the slide is removed from the road.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Bill Creamer
	Title: Land Use Specialist
Signature: /s/ Bill Creamer	Date: 4/21/11

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

I have selected the Proposed Alternative B, and recommend that the DNRC does issue a Land Use License to remove soil and debris that slid onto the county road at Clagett Hill and place (waste) the material on adjacent state land.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I have evaluated the potential environment effects and have determined that no negative long-term environmental impacts will result from the proposed activity.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS

More Detailed EA

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Barny D. Smith
	Title: Unit Manager, Northeastern Land Office
Signature: /s/ Barny Smith	Date: 4/21/11