CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Frank Leeds Water Pipeline
Proposed Implementation Date:	September 2019
Proponent:	Frank Leeds
Location:	Township 33N, 15E, S16
County:	Hill

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The proponent is requesting to place a waterline close to county road 40N on state property that will be coming off of the main city waterline and going to his private property running from east to west.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

Montana DNRC, Havre Field Office, Ryan Call - Land Use specialist
Frank Leeds, 10505 River Road, Havre, MT 59501 (406)-945-7707

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

Will need all associated permits necessary to pull water from the main water line, these permits are being requested and secured prior to digging and placing pipeline on state land.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: The alternative to allow for the use of the state land located outside of the right of way for burying a water pipeline

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: Loamy soil with agriculture on the Eastern side of the section. Area around the coulee has a sever classification for erodibility due to the slope, the rest of the area has a slight erodibility index. The target area for the pipeline is planning on avoiding the risk area and being implemented where there is no slope. The same goes for the restoration capabilities of the soil, near the slopes and coulee there is a higher risk of adverse effects. Away from the slopes of the coulee there is minimal risk for restoration failure.

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: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: The reason for this project is to bring a new waterline into private property as an old well was contaminated. There should not be any contaminants or degradation of water quality standards. Cumulative effects on water resources are likely negligible.

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: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

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: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: There is no evidence of rare plants or cover types in the scope of the project. The vegetation at this site is already being impacted by invasive grasses such as Japanese Brome (*Bromus japonicas*). Stress in the site could lead to the species to spread even worse in the area. There are no rare plants or cover types present. The vegetation would be removed as soil is stripped and the site would be replanted with plant species compatible with the proposed reclaimed use. No cumulative effects are anticipated if replanted with a proper seed mix.

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: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: There may be minimal disruption to the wildlife that inhabit the area. The scale and length of the project should not be enough to permanently disrupt the wildlife species. Species in the area include whitetail and mule deer, antelope, raptors and other birds, various rodents, rabbits, reptiles and others.

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: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Database shows that the only species of concern are Bats, Birds, and fish, none of which would have effects anticipated by the scope of this project.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Alternative A: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

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 "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

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: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: The project is being implemented between harvest and planting seasons for Agriculture land. Minimal effects are anticipated to occur as long as the project does not interfere with general farming practices.

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.

Alternative A: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

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: The "No Action" alternative

Alternative B: Typical safety risks for laborers working would be present, but the potential risk should be minimal with proper safety efforts.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:
Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: This project would have minimal effects on creating, moving, or eliminating jobs.

---

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

---

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

---

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

---

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

---

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

---

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Alternative A: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Alternative A: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected

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: The “No Action” alternative

Alternative B: No impacts expected
For conveyance of water across state land (Note: this does not apply to licenses for water conveyance where the water source is on state land.)
One-time Fee: $200 minimum (for max 10-year license term) for the first mile or any portion thereof; plus $100 per additional ½ mile or any portion thereof.
Total Estimated cost of LUL is $200 for 1 mile across state land

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Ryan Call Title: Havre - Land Use Specialist	
Signature		Date July 30, 2019

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED: Alternative B

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The granting of the requested LUL on these tracts of state-owned trust lands should not result in nor cause significant negative environmental impacts. The proposed action satisfies the trusts fiduciary mandate and ensures 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: Jocee Hedrick Title: Lewistown Unit Manager	
Signature		Date 07/30/2019