CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Land Breaking of native rangeland /crested wheatgrass on State of Montana Lease Number 279.	Proposed Implementation Date: Spring 2016
Proponent: Michael Dighans, 600 Peerless Lustre RD, Peerless, Montana 59253	
Type and Purpose of Action: Surface lessee, Michael. Dighans has made a written request for breaking of native rangeland/ crested wheatgrass to the Glasgow Unit Office of the Department of Natural Resources & Conservation. The surface lessee has requested permission to break an estimated 120.0 acres more or less of native rangeland/ crested wheatgrass. This tract of State land has intermingled areas of native rangeland with areas of crested wheatgrass. The areas of crested wheatgrass were farmed at one time, probably in the 1920's. The land breaking would be a conversion from present use of native rangeland/ tame grass to dryland agriculture for the purpose of growing small grain or pulse crops. The acreage would be reclassified from rangeland acreage to dryland agriculture for small grain or pulse crop production.	
Location: NE4, Section 6 Township 35 North Range 44 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.	Michael Dighans the surface lessee has made a request to break 120.0 acres (more or less) acres on State land Lease Number 279. The request was sent to the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Glasgow Unit Office for review and evaluation. The request will be reviewed per Department of Natural Resources and Conservation land breaking criteria for native sod/tame grass.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	The other government agencies that have jurisdiction for this project are the United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency and United States Department of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources and Conservation Service.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	No Action Alternative: Deny permission to lessee Michael Dighans to break 120.0 acres of native rangeland/tame grass acreage for small grain production. Action Alternative: Grant permission to lessee Michael Dighans to break 120.0 acres of native rangeland/tame grass acreage. The new land use will be dryland agriculture to produce small grain & pulse crops.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactible or	No Action Alternative: The soils on the State land will remain the same and continue to

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	produce native plants and tame grass vegetation. Action Alternative: This type of project will impact the soils that are currently producing native rangeland/crested wheatgrass vegetation. The soils will be broken up for the purpose of producing dryland small grain and pulse crops. The soil type that will be broken for dryland agriculture is: Farland-Cherry silt loam, 2 to 8% slopes. The Farland-Cherry silt loam is suitable for dryland agriculture. This soil type has a medium hazard to wind erosion and a moderate hazard to water erosion. Turner-Beaverton complex, 2 to 8% slopes. The Turner-Beaverton complex has a moderate hazard to wind erosion. The Turner-Beaverton complex has a medium hazard to water erosion. Cabba-Cambert-Cherry silt loam, 8 to 15% slopes. The Cabba-Cambert-Cherry silt loam has moderate to high hazard to wind and water erosion. The lessee will mitigate impacts for the hazards of wind and water erosion. This will be accomplished through management practices such as continuous cropping and chemical fallow. The 120.0 acres requested for breaking will maintain current soil qualities and soil stability under dryland agriculture management. These soil types are capable of producing 20 or more bushels per acre spring wheat. This type of yield has been determined by other State land with these types of soils producing more than 20 bushels per acre spring wheat crops. Mitigation: There will be areas of tract that will be flagged by Departmental personnel and left in permanent vegetative cover. The surface lessee plans to continuous crop or chemical fallow this acreage. The annual cropping or standing stubble will mitigate any type of soil loss from wind or water erosion,
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?	No Action Alternative: Under this alternative annual precipitation will be utilized by the native rangeland/tame grass plant community. There will be no impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution. Action Alternative: The project will allow the lessee Michael Dighans to expand his dryland agriculture small grain and pulse crop production. The land breaking for small grain and pulse crops will not use water resources, other than the water associated with the topsoil from annual precipitation.
6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	No Action Alternative: No impacts will occur to air quality under this alternative. Action Alternative: The breaking of the native rangeland/crested wheatgrass acreage for dryland agriculture purposes will have no impacts to the air quality of the State land.
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover	No Action Alternative: Under this alternative the current native rangeland/tame grass plant community will remain intact.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
types present?	Action Alternative: The breaking of the native rangeland/crested wheatgrass plant community will permanently destroy the current plant community on the project area. The native rangeland/tame grass plant community consists of native grass and forbs along with crested wheatgrass. The native rangeland/crested wheatgrass acreage contains no known rare plant species. This plant community is currently native rangeland/tame grass. There are no native vegetative plant communities in the areas containing solid stands of crested wheatgrass. There are areas of native rangeland that contain scattered crested wheatgrass plants.
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	No Action Alternative: The habitat types associated with a native rangeland/tame grass plant community will remain intact. Action Alternative: This type of activity will disturb the habitat types on the State land. The area of impact is a native rangeland/ crested wheatgrass plant community. This type of native rangeland/tame grass plant community has some areas containing habitat resources. There will be no major impacts to the wildlife and upland bird resources associated with the State land. There will be some areas of tract that will continue to produce a native and tame grass plant community. The remaining native and tame grass plant community will provide some habitat resources for song birds, upland game birds, pronghorn antelope, and whitetail deer. The 120.0 acres of native rangeland/crested wheatgrass is not a native rangeland environment or a tame grass stand environment. Wildlife Biologists and Natural Resource Managers have stated from research journals that native rangeland/tame grass plant communities provide limited/minimal habitat for upland birds, song birds, pronghorn antelope, whitetail deer and mule deer.
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?	No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no change to the current environmental resource of native rangeland/tame grass vegetation. Action Alternative: The project area contains no known unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources. The project area consists of flat to rolling terrain, with native rangeland/crested wheatgrass vegetation. There are some scattered areas of native rangeland located on this tract. The native rangeland will be impacted by the land breaking along with those areas containing crested wheatgrass plant communities. All drainages will be left intact for water runoff erosion control.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	No Action Alternative: The project area has no known historical or archaeological sites and existing status would remain. Action Alternative: There are no known

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	historical or archaeological sites on the project area that will be impacted. The project area was inspected by Randy Dirkson, Land Use Specialist from the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Glasgow Unit Office for archaeological, historical and paleontological resources. There were no historical or archaeological sites identified during the on-site inspection.
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 that would occur to the aesthetic values associated with the State land under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project site is located in a rural area and is visible to the general public from a county road. The project will have no impacts to the aesthetic values associated with the State land involved with this project or other surrounding lands. The aesthetic values of this area for the most part are dryland agriculture producing small grain and pulse crops. There are scattered tame grass/native rangelands in the vicinity of the project site. There are also scattered areas of conservation reserve program acreage scattered near project site.
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 will be no demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy occurring under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will place no demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy. The nearby activities occurring on surrounding lands are the tillage of dryland agriculture acreage for the production of small grain and pulse crops. There are some scattered areas where livestock grazing occurs on native rangeland and tame grass pastures.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no changes to existing plans, studies or projects that the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation may have occurring on the State land. Action Alternative: The breaking of the native rangeland/crested wheatgrass vegetation will not impact other projects or plans that the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation may have occurring on this tract of State land. The land breaking project will not impact surrounding deeded lands.

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: No human health or safety risks would occur under this alterative. Action Alternative: The breaking of native

	rangeland/tame grass vegetation for dryland small grain or pulse crop production has minimal human health or safety risks.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no changes to current agriculture activities. Action Alternative: The project will enhance lessee Michael Dighans ability to produce small grain and pulse crops on his State land lease. The production of dryland small grain and pulse crops on State land will also enhance the revenue generated for the School Trust. This tract of land is currently not fenced, has no water and is not grazed by livestock.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to quantity and distribution of employment. Action Alternative: The project will not impact the quantity and distribution of employment. The land breaking will be accomplished by lessee Michael Dighans or his designated hired labor force.
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	No Action Alternative: No local and state tax base and tax revenues would be impacted under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the local or state tax base.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no demands for government services. Action Alternative: The project will place no demands for government services.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	No Action Alternative: No impacts would occur to the locally adopted environmental plans or goals under this alternative. Action Alternative; The project will not impact locally adopted environmental plans and goals. The United States Department of Agriculture agencies (Farm Service Agency, Natural Resources and Conservation Service) will review this land breaking request by Michael Dighans. The writer of this document envisions that they will approve of the land breaking request with there specific management plan of operation.
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 within the tract?	No Action Alternative: No impacts would occur to access and quality of recreation associated with the State land under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project area has minimal recreational values, some upland bird hunting and hunting whitetail/mule deer or pronghorn antelope in its current status. The land breaking project will have minimal impacts to the recreational values associated with this tract of state land. There will be no impacts to recreational values on other bordering lands. The bordering lands contain habitat for upland birds, whitetail/mule deer and pronghorn antelope. The bordering lands will provide

	hunting recreational values for upland birds, whitetail/mule deer and pronghorn antelope.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	No Action Alternative: No impacts will occur to density and distribution of population and 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; No impacts will occur to native or traditional lifestyles or communities 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: No impacts will occur to the cultural uniqueness and diversity under this alternative. Action Alternative: The project will not impact the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the State land. The project will not impact cultural uniqueness and diversity of the surrounding deeded lands.
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no social or economic impacts that would occur Action Alternative: The cumulative affects of this project provides economic benefit to lessee Michael Dighans and the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, State land School Trust Fund. The dryland agriculture acreage on the State land will increase lessee Michael Dighans annual revenue from his State land lease holdings. The Department of Natural Resources will see additional revenue generated from this tract of State land for the School Trust. This tract of State land generates no revenue for lessee Michael Dighans as there is no water for livestock grazing.

EA Checklist Prepared By: \S\ Date: 4/13/16
Randy Dirkson Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Action Alternative
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	No significant impacts anticipated
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis: [ ] EIS [ ] More Detailed EA [X] No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: Matthew Poole (Name) — Glasgow Unit Manager (Title)

s/Matthew Poole\s (Signature) — Date: April 13, 2016