

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: Install a new 2-wire electric fence across School Trust land.	Proposed Implementation Date: Fall 2016
Proponent: Leo Barthelmess, Barthelmess Ranch Corp., 25826 Content Rd., Malta, MT	
Type and Purpose of Action: The applicant proposes to install a new 2-wire electric fence across approximately 100 yards of School Trust land which he leases, with the purpose of separating grazing acreage from deeded hayland acreage.	
Location: SE4SW4 of Section 16, Township 26N, Range 32E	County: Phillips

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 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 install a new fence on State land. No Action Alternative: Deny permission to the applicant to install a new fence on State land.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compatible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual	The area of impact contains Harlake clay soils, which are very deep, well-drained clayey soils on 0 to 2 percent slopes. These soils are not unusual,

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

<p>geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>fragile or unstable.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence would have very minimal impact to 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>There are no important surface or groundwater resources in the area, and no special consideration of water quality standards, etc... is necessary.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence would not negatively impact the quality, quantity and distribution of water.</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 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>The area of impact is grazing land that consists primarily of native grasses, forbs and shrubs.</p> <p>Action Alternative: 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 important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>The State land provides habitat for antelope and upland birds occasionally, as well as prairie-grassland birds.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Action Alternative: The proposed fence will have minimal impact to wildlife in the area. Antelope movements across the area may change slightly.

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?

Several species of concern are present (or seasonally present) in the area. These include: Black-tailed Prairie dog, Burrowing Owl, Greater Sage-Grouse and Long-Billed Curlew. The area is classified as "Core Habitat" for Greater Sage-Grouse by the Montana Sage Grouse Oversight Team, and is approximately 1.5 miles away from the nearest active lek. The proponent has received cost-share from the US Fish and Wildlife Service for this project. The proposed fence will have to meet any USFWS requirements for wildlife-friendly fencing (fence markers, etc...).

Action Alternative: By following any recommendations from the USFWS, no impact on important species or habitats is expected.

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?

There have been no archaeological or paleontological resources noted as part of the standard lease renewal process.

Action Alternative: No historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources will be impacted by the fence.

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

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	alternative.
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>The area of impact is very rural and will only be visible to the public from nearby Content Rd. (Phillips Co. road). Agricultural activities and fences are very prominent in the area.</p> <p>Action Alternative: 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>
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>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>
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	<p>The State land is managed for the grazing of livestock by the lessee. There are no other studies, plans or projects on the State land.</p> <p>Action Alternative: This project will benefit both 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 fence will improve rangeland quality by providing greater control over livestock grazing use of 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>

Jack Medicott Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Action
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: September 15, 2016
Signature