

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: FWP Stipek FAS Boat Ramp Stabilization
Proposed Implementation Date: 2024
Proponent: Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Location: T17N-R55E-Sec 25
County: Dawson County

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

MT FWP heretofore referred to as proponent, has requested of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation permission to install riprap revetment for bank stabilization and to protect an existing boat ramp on the west bank of the Yellowstone River on state owned portion of tract T17N-R55E-Sec 25.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

The proponent has requested that the DNRC allow the installation of riprap revetment on this state-owned portion of the section. DNRC staff has evaluated this site, and due to the nature of this request, no public comment was sought. Other permitting groups involved are, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks and the Department of Environmental Quality.

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

SPA 124 Permit	Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Section 404 Permit, Section 10 Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
318 Authorization, 401 Certification	Department of Environmental Quality

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A- Grant request for the project.

Alternative B- No Action.

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.

Alternative A- Disturbance of the soil during this project should be minimal, and long-term soil stability should be improved. There should be no lasting adverse effects to the soil stability or moisture.

Alternative B-No Impact

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.

Alternative A- Any impacts have been addressed in the permitting process.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- Pollutants and Particulates may have increased during the construction of the project. After the completion of the project pollutant and particulate levels returned to normal preconstruction levels. Increase in pollutants during construction should have been almost negligible.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- Most of the established vegetative community is outside of the project area above the high-water mark and the disturbance of these plant species should be minimal and the area should revegetate naturally. High-flow and ice scour forces have removed vegetation from most of this project area. After stabilization, some revegetation should occur naturally.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- There should be very minimal effect on any animal habitats within the boundaries of the project construction area. Wildlife may be temporarily disturbed during the construction of the project. After completion of the project wildlife usage should have returned to pre-construction levels.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Database showed the following species of concern in the general area of this project.

Hoary Bat(*Lasiurus cinereus*)
Little Brown Myotis(*Myotis lucifugus*)
Long-legged Myotis(*Myotis volans*)
Spotted Bat(*Euderma maculatum*)

American White Pelican(Pelecanus erythrorhynchos)
 Black-billed Cuckoo(Coccyzus erythrophthalmus)
 Bobolink(Dolichonyx oryzivorus)
 Brewer's Sparrow(Spizella breweri)
 Golden Eagle(Aquila chrysaetos)
 Great Blue Heron(Ardea herodias)
 Greater Sage-Grouse(Centrocercus urophasianus)
 Least Tern(Sternula antillarum)
 Loggerhead Shrike(Lanius ludovicianus)
 Red-headed Woodpecker(Melanerpes erythrocephalus)
 Sharp-tailed Grouse(Tympanuchus phasianellus)
 Snapping Turtle(Chelydra serpentina)
 Spiny Softshell(Apalone spinifera)
 Western Milksnake(Lampropeltis gentilis)
 Northern Leopard Frog(Lithobates pipiens)
 Blue Sucker(Cycleptus elongatus)
 Northern Redbelly Dace(Chrosomus eos)
 Paddlefish(Polyodon spathula)
 Pallid Sturgeon(Scaphirhynchus albus)
 Sauger(Sander canadensis)
 Shortnose Gar(Lepisosteus platostomus)
 Sicklefing Chub(Macrhobopsis meeki)
 Sturgeon Chub(Macrhobopsis gelida)

While the above listed species have been identified as having been found within the tracts as a whole, there should be minimal impact from this project due to the location, scale, and nature of the project. This project is not located within identified Greater Sage Grouse Habitat; therefore, the proponent has not submitted the project to the Montana sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Program.

Alternative B- No Impact

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

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

Alternative A- No historical or archeological sites were noted within the proposed lease area upon field inspection and a review of the TLMS database. A Class I (literature review) level review was conducted by the DNRC staff archaeologist for the area of potential effect (APE). This entailed inspection of project maps, DNRC's sites/site leads database, land use records, General Land Office Survey Plats, and control cards. The Class I search revealed that no cultural or paleontological resources have been identified in the APE. Because little ground disturbance is expected with the proposed project, and because the local geology is not likely to produce caves, rock shelters, or sources of tool stone, no additional archaeological investigative work will be conducted. However, if previously unknown cultural or paleontological materials are identified during project related activities, all work will cease until a professional assessment of such resources can be made.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A-No impacts expected

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts expected

Alternative B- No Impact

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

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION
<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.

Alternative A- There may be risks to human health and safety in the construction of the project, but this work should be done by qualified professionals. Safety concerns should be minimized with proper safety protocols employed by the workers.

Alternative B- No impact

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

Alternative A- It should have a positive effect on Agricultural Activities and Production in the area.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- No impacts expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

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

Alternative A- No Impact expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Alternative A- No Impacts expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

Alternative A- No Impacts expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

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.

Alternative A- Issuance of this license can be expected to return \$1,500.00 to the trust.

Alternative B- No Impact

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Aaron Kneeland	Date: 2-14-2024
	Title: Land Use Specialist	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative A

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The granting of the requested action on state owned trust lands for the proposed MT FWP riprap revetment should not result in nor cause significant environmental impacts. The predicted impacts should be adequately mitigated through the construction and reclamation plans. The proposed action helps ensure the long-term productivity of the land. An environmental assessment checklist is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:☐

EIS

☐

More Detailed EA

☒

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Scott Aye
	Title: ELO Land Program Manager
Signature: /s/ Scott Aye	Date: 2-14-2024