

DS-252

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Break Request	Proposed Implementation Date: January 5, 2004
Proponent: Wade Kinkelaar, State Lessee of State Lease #7579	
Type and Purpose of Action: To break an expired CRP stand, farm it to small grains for two years, then seed it to alfalfa for hay production.	
Location: NE1/4NE1/4, Sec. 21, T22N, R20E	County: Fergus

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

<p>1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.</p>	<p>MT.DNRC, Wade Kinkelaar, State Lessee</p> <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; margin: 10px 0;">RECEIVED</div> <p style="text-align: center;">MAR 16 2004</p>
<p>2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:</p>	<p>None. LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY OFFICE</p>
<p>3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:</p>	<p>The "No Action" alternative. The alternative to break the CRP stand and reclassify the land use from grazing to agriculture.</p>

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<p>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?</p>	<p>[N] Silty Clay loams are present. There are no unusual geologic features or reclamation considerations.</p>
--	--

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<p>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?</p>	<p>[N] This reclassification process will have no affect upon water quality or quantity.</p>
<p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>[N] Pollutants and particulates will not be produced.</p>
<p>7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>[Y] There are no rare plants or cover types present. The existing stand is of slender wheatgrass and crested wheatgrass. These were both introduced. This area will be farmed to small grains, then a permanent cover of alfalfa will be planted.</p>
<p>8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>[Y] This area holds lots of wildlife. The proposed alfalfa planting will attract them even more. These include elk, mule deer, antelope, coyotes, big horn sheep, and most upland game.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[N] There are no wetlands in the area. There are no species of special concern that utilize this area that I am aware of.</p>
<p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archeological, or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>[N] There are no historical, paleontological, or archaeological resources present.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[N] There will not be excessive noise or light. This is in a sparsely populated area.</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?</p>	<p>[N] Limited resources will not be used.</p>

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<p>13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?</p>	<p>[N] None.</p>
---	------------------

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

<p>14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risk in the area?</p>	<p>[N] Human health and safety will not be affected.</p>
<p>15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?</p>	<p>[Y] Agricultural activities will increase. More revenue will be generated for the school trust.</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 needed.</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.</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 needed.</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 hunting opportunities within this tract in the fall of the year.</p>
<p>21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require</p>	<p>[N] Additional housing will not be required.</p>

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

additional housing?	
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N] Disruption is not likely.
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N] There should be no shift.
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMICAL CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N] None.

EA Checklist Prepared By:

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


Signature

Date: February 11, 2004

IV. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	The alternative to break the CRP stand and reclassify it from grazing to agriculture.
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	There are no negative impacts expected. Only positive impacts should result from this request. Basically there will be more revenue generated for the school trust.
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:

CLIVE ROONEY, Area Manager, Northeastern Land Office


Signature

Date:

2-11-4