

DS-252

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Range Renovation	Proposed Implementation Date: March 1, 2004
Proponent: Humphrey Limited Partnership, State Lease #5575	
Type and Purpose of Action: To renovate an upland bench, panspot range site to increase forage production.	
Location: NW1/4, Sec. 12, T27N, R8E	County: Chouteau

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	Mt.DNRC, Humphrey Limited Partnership, Mark Humphrey.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	None.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	The "No Action" alternative. The alternative to renovate the range site to improve forage production.

RECEIVED

JAN 05 2004

LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
POLICY OFFICE

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geological features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	[N] There is a coulee running through this quarter section. The upper bench is a "pan spot" range site with limited forage production. There are no special considerations.
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?	[N] There is no water in the area.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

6.	AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N] Pollutants and particulates will not be produced.
7.	VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[Y] This proposed range renovation would permanently change the vegetative cover on the renovated acres. There are no rare plants or cover types present.
8.	TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] There is some use of the area by local wildlife, but it is not substantial.
9.	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?	[N] There are no species of special concern. The Mt.FW&P was notified of this project. A request for their input was placed. There was "no reply".
10.	HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archeological, or paleontological resources present?	[N] There are no historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present. Pat Rennie state archaeologist, cleared this project in the fall of 2003.
11.	AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographical feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	[N] This project will not be visible from populated areas. There will not be excessive noise or light associated with the project.
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?	[N] Limited resources will not be utilized.
13.	OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	[N] None.

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

14.	HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this	[N] This project will not affect human health or safety.
-----	---	--

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

<p>project add to health and safety risk in the area?</p>	
<p>15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?</p>	<p>[Y] This project will improve livestock production and commercial activities.</p>
<p>16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.</p>	<p>[N] New jobs will not be created.</p>
<p>17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?</p>	<p>[N] This project will not affect taxes in any way.</p>
<p>18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?</p>	<p>[N] Other services will not be required.</p>
<p>19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc., zoning or management plans in effect?</p>	<p>[N] None.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[Y] There is some limited hunting potential within this tract.</p>
<p>21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?</p>	<p>[N] Additional housing will not be required.</p>
<p>22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?</p>	<p>[N] Disruption is not likely.</p>
<p>23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?</p>	<p>[N] There should be no shift.</p>
<p>24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND</p>	<p>[N] None.</p>

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

ECONOMICAL CIRCUMSTANCES:

EA Checklist Prepared By:

BARNY D. SMITH, Lewistown Unit Manager, Northeastern Land Office


Signature

Date: December 8, 2003

IV. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

The alternative to renovate the range site to improve forage production.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

Minimal negative impacts are expected with this renovation project. Most of the site area is already infested with crested wheatgrass encroachment. There is very little "native" range left. A renovation to increase forage production would be beneficial to the area.

27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved by:

CLIVE ROONEY, Area Manager, Northeastern Land Office


Signature

Date:

12-16-03