

**D.N.R.C.**

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: Human Sewage Pipeline	Proposed Implementation Date: July 2, 2004
Proponent: Charles Yarger, 1343 Mayberry RD, Circle, MT 59215	
Type and Purpose of Action: Charles Yarger has submitted to the Glasgow Unit Office a Land Use License Application to place 100 feet of buried pipeline on State land for human sewage disposal.	
Location: NW4SW4, Sec.16 Twp. 19N Rge. 46E	County: McCone

**RECEIVED**

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT		SEP 10 2004
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	The applicant has returned a Land Use Application form to the Glasgow Unit Office. The purpose of the requests is to place a human waste sewage pipeline on State land. <div style="text-align: right; font-size: small; margin-top: -10px;">                         LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY OFFICE                     </div>	
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	The government agencies that have jurisdiction for this project are the McCone County Sanitararians office.	
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	Action Alternative: Grant a Land Use License to the applicant to place a human sewage pipeline on State land.  No Action Alternative: Deny a Land Use License to the applicant to place a human sewage pipeline on State land.	

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the soils on the State land under this alternative. Action Alternative: This type of

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<p>unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>project will impact the soils on the pipeline location. The impacts are minimal and the area of impact will continue to produce native vegetation over time from existing seed sources from the surrounding plant community.</p>
<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>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to water quality on the State land under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts to the surface water resources associated with the State land.</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>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the air quality under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the air quality of the land involved with the project.</p>
<p>7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the vegetation on the State land under this alternative. Action Alternative: The native vegetation along the pipeline route will see some disturbance by this type of project. The various types of vegetation will reproduce from existing seed sources.</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>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the State land habitat resources under this alternative. Action Alternative: This type of activity will disturb the habitat types on the State land. The area of impact is small in scope and there will be minimal impacts to the wildlife and upland bird resources of the area.</p>
<p>9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the environmental resources under this alternative.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?	Action Alternative: The project area contains no known unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to historical or archaeological resources under this alternative. Action Alternative: There are no known historical or archaeological sites on the areas to be impacted by this project.
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?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the aesthetics of the State land under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project site is located in a rural area and is not visible to the general public. The project will have no impacts to the aesthetic values associated with the State land involved 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?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the land water air or energy under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will place no demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to environmental documents on the State land. Action Alternative; The human waste sewage pipeline installation will not impact other projects or plans that may be occurring on the land.

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to human health or safety risks under this

	<p>alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The construction of a human sewage pipeline has various human health and safety risks. The employer and employee identify the health and safety risks as occupational hazards.</p>
<p>15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the agricultural activities under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the current agricultural activities that are occurring on the land.</p>
<p>16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.</p>	<p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to quantity and distribution or employment under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the quantity and distribution of employment.</p>
<p>17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?</p>	<p>No Action Alternative; There would be no impacts to the local and state tax base under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the local or state tax base.</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>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts on government services under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will place no demands for government services.</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>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to environmental plans or goals under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact locally adopted environmental plans and goals.</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</p>	<p>No Action Alternative; There would be no impacts to the recreational activities under this alternative.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the recreational values associated with the state</p>

within the tract?	land.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to population or housing under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will not impact the density and distribution of the population and housing on this rural area.
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to social structures under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will not impact the social structures of the local communities.
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will not impact the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the land.
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to on economic circumstances under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project provides some economic benefit to the local community businesses that supply products to the company that will be constructing the human sewage pipeline.

EA Checklist Prepared By: Randy Dirkson Land Use Specialist Date: 7-2-09  
Randy Dirkson Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Grant a Land Use License to Charles Yarger to place a human waste sewage pipeline on State land.
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL	The project will have no significant impacts to

IMPACTS:	the State land natural resources.
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:

*R Hoyt Richards*

Name

Title

*R. Hoyt Richards* Date: *7/12/04*  
 Signature