

DS-252

D.N.R.C.

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Stockwater pipeline and tank.	Proposed Implementation Date: July 15, 2004.
Proponent: Steve Roth of the IX Ranch.	
Type and Purpose of Action: To extend a stockwater pipeline from an existing well and line in Section 31 into the center of the W1/2W1/2, Sec. 30.	
Location: Sec. 30 & 31, T27N, R15E.	County: Chouteau. RECEIVED

JUL 01 2004

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY OFFICE
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	USDA-NRCS, Stuart Lomax, Consvst., MT. DNRC. This project is part of an Environmental Quality Incentives Program Contract.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	None.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	The "No Action" alternative. The alternative to implement the proposed EQIP Plan.

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] Silty soils are present. There are no unusual geologic features present.
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 little chance for ground water degradation or water degradation from this project. It is merely an extension of an existing line.

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 with this project.
7.	VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N] There are no rare plants or cover types present. The cover will have minimal disturbance.
8.	TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[Y] There are important wildlife species that utilize this area. The added water tank would benefit them.
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 in this particular area that I am aware of.
10.	HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archeological, or paleontological resources present?	[N] There are no paleontological, historical or archaeological resources present. Stuart Lomax, Conservt. for the NRCS filed a Negative findings report for this project.
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] There should not be excessive noise or light with this 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

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risk in the area?	[N] This project will not affect human health or safety.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[Y] This stockwater project will improve livestock health and production.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N] New jobs will not be created.
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N] The tax revenues will not be affected.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	[N] Other services will not be needed.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc., zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] None.
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?	[Y] There is recreational potential for upland and big game hunting within these tracts.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N] Additional housing will not be required.
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.

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMICAL CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N] None.
--	-----------

EA Checklist Prepared By:
BARNY D. SMITH, Lewistown Unit Manager, Northeastern Land Office


Signature
Date: June 11, 2004.

IV. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	The alternative to implement the proposed EQIP Plan.
---------------------------	--

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	Minimal negative impacts are expected with this project.
--	--

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: 6-11-04