

DNRC
CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Land Use License, R-Y
Proposed Implementation Date:	August 1, 2004
Proponent:	R-Y Timber, P.O. Box 220, Townsend Montana
Location:	Section 16, T4N, R4W
County:	Jefferson

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

- A. Type of Action: Land Use License:**
Proponent would like a land use license to build a temporary road cross-School Trust Land. The proposed road segment is approximately 200'X15', encompassing .069 acres of land.
- B. Purpose of Action:**
Implementation of this action would allow Proponent the ability to harvest approximately 800 MBF of sawtimber from adjacent private land. The Proponent has under timber contract, another parcel of land (owned by the same individual) directly kitty cornered to each other. At that location they need to cross either State Trust Land or U.S. Forest Land.

RECEIVED

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SEP 28 2004

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY OFFICE
Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Because of the relatively small magnitude of this project, and the fact that the current Grazing Lease (#5069) belongs to Douglas E. Salsbury, the landowner whose timber is being harvested, no extensive public involvement was sought.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

None.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

- **Alternative A: No action.**
Uses such as grazing would continue as is, at their current rate.
- **Alternative B: Land use license to approve road segment.**
Implementation of this alternative should have minimal impact on the resource as approximately 0.69 acres are involved. Current DNRC road building standards as well as BMP requirements shall apply. Estimated additional monetary return to the state is \$800.00 in the form of rental fees.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- *RESOURCES* potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain **POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS** following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Cumulative impacts to soil should be minimal due to size and duration of project. Necessary erosion control devices shall be constructed as needed to reduce surface runoff and erosion. After timber harvesting is completed, road will be grass seeded with appropriate mixture to further stabilize exposed soil.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

Impacts to water quality should be minimal. Nearest potential water source, as indicated by the application map, is approximately 660 feet southeast. An ample buffer of vegetation should prove to be enough of a sediment trap so as to prevent sediment runoff.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Impacts to air quality should be minimal due to the size and duration of the project. Hazardous slash burning should not be required as road will pass through open rangelands.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

Current vegetation is primarily that of open range grasses that are presently grazed by cattle. After sale completion road will be grass-seeded with appropriate mixtures. Any noxious weeds introduced by the implementation of this alternative (Land Use License) will be the responsibility of the Proponent to control.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Ecosystem should not change significantly from current condition due to size and duration of project. Exposed soil will be planted to grass after completion of timber sale. No major impacts to fish and animals are expected.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

NRIS was contacted to identify threatened & endangered, as well as sensitive species that are within the project area. No such species have been identified.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

DNRC Archaeologist, Pat Rennie was contacted via e-mail for information concerning possible archaeological sites within the project area. None have been identified either visually in the field by the applicant, or by staff archaeologist.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Project should have minimal effects on aesthetics, as it is located near the bottom of Bull Mountain (south of Boulder, Montana) off a minimal use gravel road. No major aesthetic impacts are expected from implementation of this project.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

None are anticipated due to project size and duration.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

None.

<p style="text-align: center;">IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION</p>

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</i>• <i>Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</i>• <i>Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</i> |
|--|

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Risk from road construction and timber-harvesting operations should not be out of the ordinary and therefore should be minimal.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

Industrial and commercial business in the surrounding area should have increased revenue due to buying and selling of rough forest products. Agricultural grazing of cattle may be impacted for a short period of time due to minimal acreage being taken out of grass production. Expected prolonged impacts should be insignificant.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

Proposed alternative should have minimal impacts to the current quantity and distribution of employment as persons involved in the implementation of this project are already working in the timber harvesting industry.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

People are currently paying taxes from the woods product industry in this region. Due to the relatively small size of this project no major changes are expected.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

There should be no major cumulative impacts related to the demand for government services as a result of the implementation of this project.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

The State Forest Land Management Plan (SFLMP), approved by the State Land Board in June 1996, guides the management of the forested trust lands. This guidance is provided in the form of general management philosophy and specific resource management standards. The strategic guidance provided by SFLMP is as follows:

- Our premise is that the best way to produce long-term income for the trust is to manage intensively for health and biologically diverse forest. Our understanding is that a diverse forest is a stable forest that will produce the most reliable and highest long-term revenue stream. Healthy and biologically diverse forest would provide for sustained income from both timber and a variety of other uses. They would also maintain stable trust income in the face of uncertainty regarding future resource values. In the foreseeable future timber management will continue to be our primary source of revenue and primary tool for achieving biodiversity objectives.

In February 2003, the State Land Board approved new Forest Management Administrative Rules (Rules) that provide programmatic direction for the Forest Management Program. These rules are written in support of the resource management standards contained within SFLMP.

The proposed action alternative complies with the Montana Forest Management Administrative Rules.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

Past access and recreational use patterns should not change on this tract of land as only .069 acres are being impacted by this project. Implementation of the alternative will be in the very southeast corner of the property.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

No measurable change of current condition is expected.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Not applicable.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Not applicable.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

Return to the Trust should result in an estimated additional \$800.00.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Shawn P. Morgan	Date: 7/27/04
	Title: Helena Unit Forester	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

I have selected the proposed action, to license a temporary road use across a corner of trust land to facilitate private forest management actions on adjacent lands.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The area involved and duration of intensive use are minimal, with no potentially adverse impacts identified.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

- EIS
 More Detailed EA
 No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: D.J. Bakkes	
	Title: Helena Unit Mgr	
Signature:	<i>David J. Bakkes</i>	Date: 8-3-04