

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: Miller Brother's Stock Tank and Fence Improvement	Proposed Implementation Date: 2016
Proponent: Matthew Miller, 40 Spring Coulee Rd., Glasgow MT 59230	
Type and Purpose of Action: The applicant proposes to improve an existing fence along the boundary of State land and the town of St. Marie, as well as install a 10' fiberglass stock tank on the State grazing land. The fence consists of steel posts with 3 or 4 barbed wires. Posts and wires will be replaced as needed.	
Location: Section 32, Township 31N, Range 40E	County: Valley

I. 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 plans to run cattle on the tract after acquiring the lease on nearby State land. The proponent contacted Glasgow Unit Office personnel about the project and it was agreed that the improvements would benefit the lessee and use of the resources on the State land.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	DNRC manages the surface of these lands and no other agencies have jurisdiction over the project. No additional permits needed.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	Action Alternative: Grant permission to the applicant to improve the existing fence and install a stock water tank on State land.  No Action Alternative: Deny permission to the applicant to improve the existing fence and install a stock water tank on State land.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<p>4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compatible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The area of impact contains clayey loam soils that are not unusual, fragile or unstable. The proposed fence and stock tank would have very minimal impact on soils on the State land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no changes to soils on the State land.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence would not negatively impact the quality, quantity and distribution of water. The stock tank could potentially add to surface runoff in the case of overflow of the tank. An existing well would be used to procure groundwater for use in the tank.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative, there will be no impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution.</p>
<p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence project and stock tank will have no impact on air quality, nor is it influenced by air quality regulations.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to air quality.</p>
<p>7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The area of impact is primarily cropland that produces small grains and the occasional pulse crop. There is a small amount of grazing land that consists primarily of non-native grasses. No permanent alteration of the vegetative community is expected to occur.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plant communities on the State land.</p>
<p>8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The State land provides habitat for upland birds and antelope. There is little potential</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

important wildlife, birds or fish?

for recreation on this State land, due to its close proximity to the town of St. Marie. Greater sage-grouse may be seasonally present in the impacted area, but the temporary fence will have very minimal impact on any wildlife species present.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the possible use of the State land as wildlife habitat.

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: Several species of concern are seasonally present in this area, including: Little Brown Myotis, Baird's Sparrow, Sprague's Pipit, Chestnut-collared Longspur, Greater Sage-Grouse, Loggerhead Shrike and McCown's Longspur. The area of impact is mostly within Greater Sage Grouse "General" habitat, with a very small part of the fence being within "Core" habitat. The nearest lek is approximately 5 miles away. The proximity of the tract to St. Marie and a paved highway mean that the tract is rarely used by Greater Sage-Grouse. The applicant would be required to install a bird escape ramp in the proposed stock tank. Fence markers are not necessary due to the distance from nearest lek and extremely low potential use of the area by Greater Sage-Grouse. There are no sensitive plants present in the area. No wetlands or sensitive habitat is in the area of impact.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the environmental resources.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?

Action Alternative: The area of impact contains no archaeological or paleontological resources.

No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to historical or archaeological sites under this alternative.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
<p>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?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The area of impact is right along Hwy. 24 and directly adjacent to the town of St. Marie, so it is very visible to the public. However, the proposed project will not significantly alter the aesthetics of the land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to aesthetics associated with the State land.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed project would place no additional demands on any environmental resources in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no additional demands placed on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.</p>
<p>13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: This project will benefit the plan decided on between the lessee and Glasgow Unit staff, by providing better control over distribution of livestock.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plans or studies that Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation has on the State land.</p>

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed project will not add to human health and safety risks in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to human health or safety.</p>

<p>15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The improved fence will improve rangeland quality by providing greater control over livestock grazing use of the tract. The stock tank will allow the lessee to graze livestock without having to haul water to the tract.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to agricultural activities on the State land.</p>
<p>16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not create nor impact any jobs in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to quantity and distribution of employment under this alternative.</p>
<p>17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the local and state tax base and tax revenues.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to the local and state tax base under this alternative.</p>
<p>18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not create an additional demand for government services, nor will it impact traffic along existing roads.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no additional demand for government services.</p>
<p>19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The project has already cleared State (GUO) management plans before implementation.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this type of alternative there will be no impacts on locally adopted environmental plans and goals.</p>
<p>20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or</p>	<p>Action Alternative: There is little potential for recreation within the tract and surrounding areas, due to the proximity of the town of St.</p>



IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Action Alternative
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	No significant impacts are anticipated.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis: <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis	

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

s/Matthew Poole\s Date: February 5, 2016  
Signature