

## DNRC - Trust Land Management Division

DS-252

### CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Project Name:** Craig Thomas- West Twin Creek Crossing

**Proposed Implementation Date:** 12/03

**Proponent:** Craig Thomas- Forestry Consultant for Rex Lincoln

**Type and Purpose of Action:** Craig has acquired a 310 permit for a temporary crossing of West Twin Creek. This Alternative Practice is to allow machinery into the SMZ to access this crossing from each side of the stream. The area accessed is 13.5 acres of flat ground with many of the lodgepole killed or being killed by mountain pine beetle. The trees will be skidded across an ice bridge during winter conditions. Machinery operation within the SMZ will only be on the single trail across the stream. This temporary crossing is in lieu of building a permanent road. If a fully engineered road and a permanent crossing were installed, an Alternative Practice would not be necessary.

**County:** Mineral

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	The landowner (Rex Lincoln); the Contractor (Craig Thomas); Mineral Co. Conservation Dist.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	Mineral Co. Conservation Dist.- Decided that a ford over an ice bridge would suffice for a temporary crossing to skid this piece of property
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	1. To construct a permanent road with a bridge or a culvert across the stream. This would disturb more soil and leave a more permanent scar. 2. To deny the Alternative Practice and leave the bug killed lodgepole standing on that side of the creek.
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)
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] The soils along the SMZ are gravelly and not very compactable. The bed of the stream is very rocky. The Conservation District decided that this stream bed is solid enough and the banks are low enough that a ford would cause very little damage.

# RECEIVED

JAN 07 2004

LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL  
POLICY OFFICE

<p>4. 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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? Would the ability of the SMZ to serve the following functions be compromised as a result of this Alternative Practice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Ability to act as an effective sediment filter.</li> <li>* Ability to provide shade to regulate stream temperature.</li> <li>* Protection of stream channel and banks.</li> <li>* Ability to provide large, woody debris for eventual recruitment into the stream to maintain riffles pools and other elements of channel structure.</li> <li>* Promotes floodplain stability.</li> </ul>	<p>[N] This creek is a class I stream. It has a rocky bottom and the banks are very low so little sediment will enter the stream. Operations will be done on frozen ground and a slash filter windrow will be installed at the end of the operation. The minimum tree retention standards will be maintained and very few shrubs will be affected along the stream. Since only one trail will cross the stream, very little of the SMZ will be affected.</p> <p>So little of the SMZ will be affected (one trail width) that no function of the SMZ will be affected.</p>
<p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)? 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] The minimum number of retention trees will be retained and very little of the brush will be affected.</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? Would the ability to support diverse and productive aquatic and terrestrial habitats be compromised?</p>	<p>[N]</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 ]</p>
<p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<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?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[N]</p>

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?	<b>[Y] Although this is a small project, it will create employment for a short period of time.</b>
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?	<b>[Y] Income from the harvesting of trees in this area will generate a small amount of tax revenue.</b>
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]
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N]
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? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]
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 Eric Norris	Title Service Forester
Date 12/5/03	IV. FINDING
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Proposed Action - Allow crossing of the dry stream channel.
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	No significant impacts are anticipated.
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:

Norm Fortunate \_\_\_\_\_ Service Forester \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name Title  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature Date 12-5-03