CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	McKamey Ranch and 3M Ranch existing bridge
Proposed Implementation Date:	7/1/2011
Proponent:	McKamey Ranch and 3M Ranch
Location:	NESE 30, T17N, R3E
County:	Cascade
Trust:	Common School

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Establish a lawful easement for a 46 year old existing bridge over the Smith River.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

None – The McKamey use has been in place since at least 1965, when the current bridge was built by them. This use qualifies for a historic easement process, in which no environmental review is required, since there is no actual change of use. The 3M Ranch has acquired access across the McKamey property through their own private negotiations. The 3M Ranch would also want to cross the existing bridge, however their use has not taken place since before 1997 (the time frame cut-off for "historical" easements) and as such triggered a survey and this environmental review. The bridge has been in place for 46 years, and there really is no identifiable change in use taking place, no new construction to trigger new stream permits, etc.

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

None, bridge is existing.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

A – Do not recommend issuance of these two easements.
B – Recommend land Board issuance of easements before October 2011. (see section 24 of this EAC.)

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years. (In fact, the bridge is almost old enough to be considered historic itself.)

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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 effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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 effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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 effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

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.

This segment of the Smith River is currently on the DNRC navigable river list. As such uses taking place between the low water marks of the River should have a license or easement for their use. The 2011 Legislature passed, and the Governor signed into Law, S.B. 35, which modifies the definition of navigable rivers, for title purposes. This Law will take effect October 1, 2011. The Smith River has not been adjudicated for title purposes, as defined in S.B. 35, and so this section of the Smith River may not be considered navigable after that date, and DNRC may therefore not have jurisdiction to issue easements there after October 1, 2011.

The existing single lane bridge is 12 feet wide and spans 101.8 feet between the low water marks of the River, for an acreage of 0.028 ac. Land value adjacent to the Smith River would need to exceed $10,714.29/acre, for 50% of this value times 0.028 acres to exceed the DNRC minimum Easement fee of $150. The recommended fee for each of these easements is therefore $150.00.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	**Name:**	D.J. Bakken	**Date:**	6/ 22 /2011
	Title:	Helena Unit Manager		

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

After review I have chosen Alternative B

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

No effects, bridge has been in place for 46 years.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

	EIS		More Detailed EA	x	No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	**Name:**	Gavin Anderson
	Title:	Forest & Lands Program Manager, CLO
Signature:		**Date**: 6/22/11