

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Hogum Creek Homesite SMZ Alternative Practice
Proposed Implementation Date:	May 2016
Proponent:	Contractor John Wilkins
Location:	Sections 16 and 17 Township 14 North Range 7 West
County:	Lewis and Clark

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

John Wilkins has applied for a Streamside Management Zone (SMZ) Alternative Practice on approximately 500 feet of Hogum Creek and 200 feet of an unnamed class 2 tributary to Hogum Creek. The purpose of the Alternative Practice is to clear trees for a home site and create defensible space for the future home.

The application involves the following specific requests:

- Deviate from species and size class retention requirements (36.11.305) of leaving ten trees per 100 lineal feet of stream bank on class one streams and leaving five trees per 100 lineal feet on class two streams.
- Operate Equipment within the SMZ.
- Harvest trees that were previously cut down and are lying, elevated, across a class two stream.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

This is private property and no public scoping is involved.

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

Building permits may be required for the structure the landowner is planning on building. These permits are outside the scope of this Environmental Analysis.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No Action Alternative: Timber harvest would likely occur and meet all SMZ rules. However, following harvest the trees posing safety hazards could be cut down as part of a non-commercial operation. This non-commercial operation would not be regulated under the Streamside Management Zone Law.

Action Alternative: Under this alternative, an Alternative Practice would be granted. The Alternative Practice would allow the proponent to harvest trees below minimum levels outlined in the SMZ law, operate equipment within the SMZ, and remove trees that are lying across a class 2 stream. As a stipulation of the Alternative Practice mitigations measures outlined in this document would be followed.

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.

Logging is currently taking place, in accordance with the SMZ law. The proposed Alternative Practice area is essentially flat and has been heavily impacted by previous human activity. Impacts include an existing native surface driveway, an old cabin site, and excavated areas that appear to be from past mining. Also an above ground powerline currently runs across the area and this powerline is scheduled to be buried. It is unlikely there would be further impacts to geology, soil quality, stability and moisture under either alternative.

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.

Is it possible that implementing this alternative practice would impact the integrity of the SMZ and these specific functions?

- Ability to act as an effective sediment filter.*
- Ability to provide shade to regulate stream temperature.*
- Protection of stream channel and banks.*
- Ability to provide large woody debris for eventual recruitment into the stream to maintain riffles, pools, and other elements of channel stability.*

Existing Condition

Hogum Creek is a class 1 stream that has numerous channels, beaver ponds and adjacent wetlands. Trees on the project area consist primarily of lodgepole pine and spruce, with Douglas-fir also on site. Approximately 25 percent of the mature lodgepole pine has been killed by the mountain pine beetle. Areas immediately adjacent to the stream are generally well vegetated with native shrubs such as willow and alder.

On the property there is an existing road and a bridge over Hogum Creek which leads to the proposed building site. The class two stream that exists on the project area begins approximately 300 feet from Hogum Creek. In this 300 foot long segment of stream there is a culvert crossing that currently does not meet forestry Best Management Practices. The culvert crossing is on a low standard powerline road. Also on site is a septic system and old cabin remnants.

Potential Environmental Effects

No Action Alternative:

- The SMZ law would be followed for this commercial timber harvest therefore it is unlikely there would be impacts to water quality, quantity or distribution or the integrity of the SMZ during this operation. Following completion of the commercial harvest non-commercial cutting, outside the jurisdiction of the SMZ law, could occur. Under the no action alternative mitigations for tree removal would not be enforceable.

Action Alternative:

- The ability of the SMZ to act as an effective sediment filter would not be impacted beyond baseline conditions because the ground is on gentle slopes. All live trees that are not likely to blow down would

be retained to the extent practicable; this includes sub-merchantable trees and shrubs. Only limited ground scarification beyond existing conditions would be expected. However if areas are disturbed grass seeding would be required. Under the proposed action measure the planting of native shrubs adjacent to the stream bank would be required.

-The ability of the SMZ to provide shade is maintained by the remaining sub-merchantable trees and shrubs. Additionally, as a mitigation measure, the proponent would be required to plant site specific shrubs.

-Full protection of the stream channel and banks is maintained by keeping equipment on existing roads or at least 15 feet away from the stream at all times.

-The ability to provide large woody debris for eventual recruitment would be maintained by leaving trees that are not threatening the future building site.

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.

Slash created from the project would need to be disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws. Impacts would be expected to be the same under either alternative.

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.

No Action: Harvest would occur without a SMZ alternative practice and tree retention requirements of the SMZ law would be met. At a later date hazard trees within the SMZ would likely be cut, but would not be sold as part of a commercial Forest Practice.

Action Alternative: Trees would be harvested within the SMZ and tree retention requirements would not be met on approximately 700 feet of streamside.

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.

No Action: The SMZ law would followed and no impacts to fish, wildlife or birds would be expected.

Action Alternative: The ability to support diverse and productive aquatic, avian and terrestrial habitat would be maintained by the scattered nature of the proposed operation and the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

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.

No impacts to unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources would be expected under either alternative.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

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

If the proposed action alternative is selected no impacts beyond those expected under the no action alternative would likely occur.

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.

If the proposed action alternative is selected no impacts beyond those expected under the no action alternative would likely occur.

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.

If the proposed action alternative is selected no impacts beyond those expected under the no action alternative would likely occur.

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.

None.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

None.

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.

Under either alternative the project would be expected to keep current jobs active for the duration of the project. If the action alternative were selected the jobs could last a few weeks longer.

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.

No change in local and state tax base and tax revenues would be expected under either alternative.

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

No change in government services would be expected under either alternative.

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.

None.

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.

The proposed action alternative and the no action alternative would have the same impacts to access and quality of recreational and wilderness activities.

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.

The project has no direct implications for density and distribution of population and housing.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

No measurable impacts related to social structures and mores would be expected under either alternative.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

No measurable impacts related to cultural uniqueness and diversity would be expected under either alternative.

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.

N/A

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Neil Simpson	Date: April 28, 2016
	Title: Service Forester	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Following a review of the document as well as the corresponding Department policies and rules, the Action Alternative has been selected because it meets the intent of the project objectives outlined in Section I – Type and Purpose of Action. This includes but is not limited to the need to clear trees for a home site and create defensible space for the future home.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

I find that the Action Alternative will not have significant impacts for the following reasons:

- The Action Alternative is in compliance with the existing laws, rules, policies, and standards applicable to this type of proposed action.
- Appropriate mitigations have been proposed to minimize potential impacts to resources such as terrestrial, avian and aquatic life and habitats; soil; vegetation; and water quality, quantity, and distribution.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS

More Detailed EA

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Kristen S. Baker-Dickinson Title: Clearwater Unit Manager
Signature: /s/ <i>K. Baker-Dickinson</i>	Date: 5/2/2016