CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Hansen Trespass Easement
Proposed Implementation Date: January 1, 2014
Proponent: David & Carol Hansen
Location: Section 16, T11N R15W
County: Granite

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The proponent has applied for a permanent easement on approximately 1 acre of DNRC land on which they constructed their home and driveway.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. List number of individuals contacted, number of responses received, and newspapers in which notices were placed and for how long. Briefly summarize issues received from the public.

A Scoping Notice was sent to 6 potentially interested parties and posted on the DNRC website for 30 days beginning on August 26, 2013. No comments were received.

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

Examples: cost-share agreement with U.S. Forest Service, 124 Permit, 3A Authorization, Air Quality Major Open Burning Permit.

N/A

3. ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT:

Describe alternatives considered and, if applicable, provide brief description of how the alternatives were developed. List alternatives that were considered but eliminated from further analysis and why.

Alternative 1-No Action-Do not grant the Hansen's an easement and allow their residence to remain in trespass.

Alternative 2-Do not grant the Hansen's an easement and have them remove their improvements from DNRC ownership.

Alternative 3-Grant the Hansen's a permanent easement for approximately 1 acre and allow their improvements to remain in place.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to soils.

The site does not contain any of the above referenced conditions. The soil impacts which resulted from the construction of the Hansen's residence have for the most part recovered. Removal of the Hansen's improvements could cause further disturbance of the geologic/soil resources on the site.

---

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to water resources.

The site is extremely dry and rocky, little impact to the water resource would be expected through implementation of any of the three proposed alternatives.

---

6. AIR QUALITY:
What pollutants or particulate would be produced (i.e. particulate matter from road use or harvesting, slash pile burning, prescribed burning, etc)? Identify the Airshed and Impact Zone (if any) according to the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to air quality.

Implementation of any of the three proposed alternatives is not likely to have any appreciable impact on air quality.

---

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to vegetation.

The impacts to the vegetative community from the construction of the Hansen's residence have largely recovered and will continue to do so if the residence is left in place. Should Alternative 2 be selected, the removal of the Hansen's improvements is likely to cause additional vegetative disturbance which would take time to recover.

---

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:
Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

The limited size of the proposed easement presents little risk of impacts to this resource regardless of the alternative selected.

---

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

None of these resources occur within the proposed easement area.

---

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
Identify and determine direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

None of these resources occur within the proposed easement area.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to aesthetics.

The proposed easement is on a prominent topographic feature which is readily visible from Interstate 90. There are several other residences nearby on similar sites which does lessen the visual impact of the Hansen's residence and driveway. The implementation of Alternative 2 would, over time, restore the visual quality of the site.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to environmental resources.

N/A

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.

N/A

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- *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.*

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

N/A

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

N/A

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

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

N/A

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

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

N/A

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

N/A

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.

N/A

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

There is limited recreational access to the southern edge of the DNRC's holdings in Section 16, T11N R15W due to the private ownership between the Frontage Rd. and the DNRC land. Selection of Alternatives 1&3 would not change the public access to this land.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:
Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to population and housing.

N/A

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

N/A

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

N/A

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

Selection of Alternative 1 is not appropriate as this would not provide a return to the Common School Trust should the Hansen's residence remain onsite without compensation. Selection of Alternative 2 while returning the site to an unoccupied condition would cause environmental impacts that may take several years to recover and may have long term impacts on the productivity of the site. Selection of Alternative 3 would provide a return to the Common School Trust while minimizing any further impacts to the site.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	**Name: Jonathan Hansen** **Title: Missoula Unit Manager**	**Date: November 7, 2013**

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative 3-issuance of a permanent easement on approximately 1 acre of DNRC land to allow the Hansen's residence to remain in place and compensate the Trust.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

Analysis of the implementation of the selected alternative does not pose any risk of significant impacts to the site of the proposed easement.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

[ ] EIS [ ] More Detailed EA [X] No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	**Name:** Dana Boruch **Title:** Right-of-Way Specialist
Signature: Dana M. Boruch	**Date:** 11-7-2013