DS-252

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: The surface lessee has proposed to place a stockwater pit on State land Lease No. 8834.	Proposed Implementation Date: Fall 2013
Proponent: Lyle R. Davis, 340 Lower Valley RD, Kalispell, Montana 59901	
Type and Purpose of Action: Lyle R. Davis has submitted an Improvements Form Application to the Glasgow Unit Office to place a stockwater pit on State land. The purpose for this project is to increase available water for livestock on State land lease No. 8834. This will allow the State land to be used as a separate pasture in the future, should the lessee or DNRC decide to completely fence the State land in the future. The stockwater pit will be 80 feet by 140 feet with a 10 foot depth.	
Location: NW4SW4, Section 3 Township. 32 North, Range 36 East	County: Daniels

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	Lyle R. Davie has submitted an Improvements Form application to the Glasgow Unit Office. The purpose of the Improvements Form application is to acquire permission to place a stockwater pit on State land. The stockwater pit will supply water to the State and possible surrounding deeded lands. The stockwater pit is for improved grazing management of the surrounding deeded lands.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	The government agencies that may have jurisdiction for this project are the Montana Department of Natural Resource and Conservation, Trust Lands Management Division. Water The Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Water Rights Division may also have rules and regulations that apply to stockwater developments.
	Action Alternative: Approve an

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	Improvements Request form to allow Lyle R. Davis to place a stockwater pit on State land. No Action Alternative: Deny the Improvements Request form to Lyle R. Davis to place a stockwater pit 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 unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	Action Alternative: This type of project will impact the silty loam/clay soils at the stockwater pit location. The impacts are minimal to the native plant community. The disturbed area around the stockwater pit will be seeded to native grass species No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
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?	Action Alternative: The project will improve the ability to have a reliable livestock water source on the State land. The stockwater pit will also service livestock water needs on some surrounding deeded land. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the air quality of the land involved with the project. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	Action Alternative: The native vegetation around the stockwater pit construction will see some disturbance by this type of project. The area around the stockwater pit will be reclaimed with the seeding of native grass species. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	Action Alternative: This type of activity will disturb the habitat types on the State land. The area of impact is small in scope. There will be minimal impacts to the wildlife and upland bird habitat resources of the area. The stockwater pit will enhance the water availability for wildlife, song birds and waterfowl. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
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?	Action Alternative: The project area contains no known unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	Action Alternative: The project area contains no known historical or archaeological sites. The project area was inspected by Randy Dirkson, Land Use Specialist, Glasgow Unit Office for the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
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?	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. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
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?	Action Alternative: The project will place no demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	Action Alternative: The stockwater pit will not impact other projects or plans that the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation may have occurring on the State land. This project may enhance the manageability of the State land should this tract be fenced from surrounding lands. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.

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?	Action Alternative: The construction of a stockwater pit involves construction equipment which has various human health and safety risks. The employer and employee identify the health and safety risks as occupational

	hazards. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	Action Alternative: The project will enhance the current livestock grazing activities that are occurring on the State land. The project will also enhance surrounding lands with a water source for livestock. The water source should also enhance grazing management practices. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	Action Alternative: The project will not impact the quantity and distribution of employment. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the local or state tax base. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	Action Alternative: The project will place no demands for government services. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	Action Alternative: The project will not impact locally adopted environmental plans and goals. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS	Action Alternative: The project will not impact the recreational

ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	values associated with the state land. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	Action Alternative: The project will not impact the density and distribution of the population and housing on this rural area. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	Action Alternative: The project will not impact the social structures of the local communities. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	Action Alternative: The project will not impact the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the land. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	Action Alternative: The project provides some economic benefit to the local community business. This economic benefit will be possibly supplying the contractor with various products during the pit construction. No Action Alternative: No impacts under this alternative.

EA Checklist Prepared By:_____/S/_____Date:
Randy Dirkson, Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING	

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Action Alternative: The action alternative was selected. The Department of Natural Resources and Conservation will grant permission to Lyle R. Davis to place a stockwater pit on State of Montana land.
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	The stockwater pit project will have no significant impacts to the State land natural resource. The native rangeland will be enhanced with a stockwater pit for livestock and wildlife.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis: [ ] EIS [ ] More Detailed EA [X] No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: s/Matthew Poole\s Glasgow Unit Manager

Name Title

October 23, 2013

Date