CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	XTO Energy, Inc. River Bank Stabilization
Proposed Implementation Date:	2020
Proponent:	XTO Energy, Inc.
Location:	T22N-R59E-Sec 1
County:	Richland County

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

XTO Energy, Inc., heretofore referred to as proponent, has requested of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation permission to install a riprap revetment along the south bank of the Yellowstone River for bank stabilization on state owned portion of tract T22N-R59E-Sec 1.

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. The proponent has applied for a joint 310/404 permit. Other permitting groups involved are the Local Conservation District, the Local Floodplain Administer, 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:

310 Permit	Richland County Conservation District
Floodplain Permit	Richland County/City of Sidney Floodplain Administrator
Section 404 Permit, Section 10 Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
318 Authorization, 401 Certification	Department of Environmental Quality
SPA 124 Permit	Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A- Grant request for the project and issue a Land Use License.

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.

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- Work will be done "in the dry" to the extent practicable to avoid or minimize impacts to surface waters. Work will comply with the surface water quality standards and procedures per State of Montana Administration Rule 17.30, Subchapter 6.

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 increase during the construction of the project. After the completion of the project pollutant and particulate levels should return to normal preconstruction levels. Increase in pollutants during construction should be 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 DNRC staff search of the Montana Natural Heritage Database showed that the following threatened or endangered species may occur in the proposed project area: **Black-tailed Prairie Dog** *(Cynomys*

ludovicianus), **Sauger** *(Sander canadensis)* **,Sicklefin Chub** *(Macrhybopsis meeki),* **Sturgeon Chub** *(Macrhybopsis gelida)* This project is not located within Greater Sage Grouse General, Core, or Connectivity Habitat.

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 easement 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. A such, no additional archaeological investigative work will be conducted in response to this proposed development. 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-The bank stabilization project will lessen the slope and add material to the bank. High water and ice scours will impact revegetation, but some revegetation should occur naturally.
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

- *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.*

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 Industrial and Commercial 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- Project has potential to assist in maintaining or increasing employment.

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- Return of $1500.00 to the trust through the issuance of a Land Use License.
Alternative B- No Impact

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Aaron Kneeland	Date: 12-17-2019
	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 XTO Energy, Inc. 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 [X] No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Scott Aye	
	Title: ELO Land Program Manager	
Signature: /s/ Scott Aye		Date: 12-17-2019