

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Structure Removal 1S 3E 22
Proposed Implementation Date:	2/2/2015
Proponent:	Bozeman Unit DNRC
Location:	Township 1 South, Range 3 East, Section 22
County:	Gallatin
Trust:	Montana Tech

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Remove structures and debris from an abandoned residential lease to return the ground to productive use and eliminate the hazards associated with the degrading structures.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. List number of individuals contacted, number of responses received, and newspapers in which notices were placed and for how long. Briefly summarize issues received from the public.

May 24, 2010, Residential Lease #9857 was abandoned, but the improvements were not removed.

August 21, 2014, DNRC took possession of the abandoned improvements pursuant to Section 77-2-314, M.C.A.

August 28, 2014, DNRC filed notice with the Gallatin County Clerk and Recorder Office of the reversion of the improvement to the State of Montana.

January 15, 2015, DNRC contacted the agricultural lessee for T1S R3E 22 and requested permission to haul the debris across their land and bridge for removal. Permission was granted on frozen ground.

January 22, 2015, DNRC contracted for an asbestos inspection report on the structures.

January 27, 2015, Montana Natural Heritage, Species of Concern Report

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

Examples: cost-share agreement with U.S. Forest Service, 124 Permit, 3A Authorization, Air Quality Major Open Burning Permit.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality – No permit required since this is considered a residential property.

OSHA – No permit required since this is considered a residential property.

NESHAP – Not permit required for Residential.

3. ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT:

Describe alternatives considered and, if applicable, provide brief description of how the alternatives were developed. List alternatives that were considered but eliminated from further analysis and why.

Alternative A – Remove the structures and debris from the site.

Alternative B - Leave the structures and debris in place.

Alternatives considered but eliminated from further consideration –

The alternative of selling the improvements and having them removed is not going to receive further consideration since the cost of removal is greater than the value of the improvements.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- | |
|--|
| <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> |
|--|

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to soils.

The USDA soil survey for Gallatin County indicates the soils are classified as Glendive Sandy Loam and Chinook Fine Sandy Loam.

Alternative A – The Glendive Sandy Loam and the Chinook Fine Sandy Loam are rated as “prime farmland if irrigated” by the USDA and should be able to produce about 1200 pounds of forage per acre in an average year as range land.

Alternative B – The site will remain unavailable for farming or forage, due to the obstacles and hazards presented by the infrastructure.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to water resources.

Camp Creek is located about 50 feet to the south and 150 feet east of the barn structure, with undisturbed ground vegetated with tame grasses between them.

Alternative A – The demolition and removal of the structures would not encroach on the Camp creek, nor would there be disturbance of the creek bank. The vegetative filtering currently between the barn and creek would remain undisturbed and continue to limit migration of sediment into the creek. Any increase in delivery of sediment to the creek would be expected to be minor and short duration.

Alternative B – The creek will continue to be buffered by the 50 foot strip of land in which it is well vegetated.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced (i.e. particulate matter from road use or harvesting, slash pile burning, prescribed burning, etc)? Identify the Airshed and Impact Zone (if any) according to the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to air quality.

The parcel is located adjacent to Camp Creek and surrounded by farm ground. It is affected by dust from the road along with air borne particulate associated with farming practices.

Alternative A – Demolition and removal of the structures will introduce dust to the airshed, it can be expected to be short term since the project would be completed in less than a week.

The structures have been tested for asbestos. Asbestos was found on 3 pipes wrapped in insulation and in the drywall mud. The asbestos wrapped pipes contain a friable form of asbestos and will require abatement and disposal prior to demolition. The asbestos found in the drywall mud is 3% chrysotile. The DEQ and EPA allow the drywall materials to be composited, once the positive mud is composited with the negative drywall and negative tape the result is less than 1% asbestos; which is below the regulatory threshold for DEQ and EPA. For permit purpose and waste disposal the drywall component of the house is below regulatory thresholds and can be treated as a non-regulated material allowing disposal as general construction waste.

OSHA does not allow for a composite of the materials, they see each layer as its own material, so the drywall mud is positive and must be handled as asbestos containing. The material can be demolished along with the rest of the house, but the material must be keep wet and dust to a minimum. Class II OSHA work practice must be followed which will require the demolition contractor to do some personal air monitoring on employee(s) while they are handling the materials.

Once structure removal is completed the land would be expected to return to agricultural use.

Alternative B – No increase in adverse effects to the airshed unless one of the structures were to catch fire.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to vegetation.

There are no rare plants on the easement site; it has numerous weeds that are difficult to control do to the abandoned debris and buildings.

Alternative A – Once the buildings were removed the ground would be contoured and planted to a tame grass species.

Alternative B – Continued weed issues.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

The debris filled derelict structures provide habitat for fauna such as insects, small animals (rodents), deer, and birds.

Alternative A – Removal of the structures will allow for habitat to return to an ag/field habitat with an associated riparian area.

Alternative B – Continued structural habitat type.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

The Montana Natural Heritage Program lists no plant species of concern in the site habitat in Township 1 South Range 5 East. The Montana Natural Heritage Program lists Bobolink as sensitive in moist grasslands and Plains spadefoots as sensitive in wetlands and flood plain pools.

Alternative A – No effects to unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources are anticipated. The work conducted will affect neither the adjacent moist grasslands or the flood plain

Alternative B - No effects to unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources are anticipated.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

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

The house does not exceed 50 years of age and is therefore not considered a cultural resource as defined under the Montana State Antiquities Act.

Alternative A - No effects are anticipated.

Alternative B – No effects are anticipated.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to aesthetics.

The property is located about a mile south of Amsterdam, Montana on a 40 acre tract of State Land. The character of the area is farmland with occasional scattered farm house and barn. This property is obviously neglected and run down, a condition made more obvious due to the cattle panel fencing erected to keep people out.

Alternative A – Removal of the structures and debris will conform to the surrounding farm land.

Alternative B – Continue as a derelict property.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to environmental resources.

The structures are derelict and littered with abandon debris.

Alternative A – Removing the structures and debris would make the land available for other uses, including recreation and agricultural production and blend into the surrounding environment.

Alternative B – If the structures and debris are not removed they will continue to contribute to the impression of a degrading neighborhood, possibly affecting local land values.

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

Alternative A – No effects anticipated.

Alternative B – No effects are anticipated.

<p style="text-align: center;">IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION</p> <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.

The structures are derelict and though the site is closed, there is a risk to unauthorized users. Asbestos has been identified on site.

Alternative A – Removing the structures and debris will eliminate the risk to unauthorized users. Asbestos was found on 3 pipes wrapped in insulation and in the drywall mud. The asbestos wrapped pipes contain friable form of asbestos and will require abatement and disposal prior to demolition. The asbestos found in the drywall mud is 3% chrysotile. The DEQ and EPA allow the drywall materials to be composited, once the positive mud is composited with the negative drywall and negative tape the result is less than 1% asbestos; which is below the regulatory threshold for DEQ and EPA. For permit purpose and waste disposal the drywall component of the house is below regulatory thresholds and can be treated as a non-regulated material allowing disposal as general construction waste.

OSHA does not allow for a composite of the materials, they see each layer as its own material, so the drywall mud is positive and must be handled as asbestos containing. The material can be demolished along with the rest of the house, but the material must be kept wet and dust to a minimum. Class II OSHA work practice must be followed which will require the demolition contractor to do some personal air monitoring on employee(s) while they handling the materials.

Alternative B – The risk to unauthorized users will remain.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

This property is currently unproductive.

Alternative A – Removal of the debris and structures will make it possible to convert this property back to agricultural production.

Alternative B – The property would remain unproductive.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the employment market.

The property doesn't currently benefit job creation directly or indirectly.

Alternative A – Removal of the structures and debris will have a very small impact on jobs.

Alternative B – No jobs will be affected.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

These parcels are located on State and City land and contribute very little to the tax rolls.

Alternative A – Property will remain State land and not contribute taxes.

Alternative B – Property will remain State land and not contribute taxes.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

The structures are currently housing left over abandon debris. The site is classified as a homesite lease and closed to the public by statute.

Alternative A – Removing the structures and debris would make the land available for other uses, including recreation and agricultural production, but would not be expected to increase the need for government services.

Alternative B – If the structures are not removed they could be illegally used for illicit activity, requiring law enforcement action.

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.

There are no environmental plans or zoning for this area.

Alternative A – No effects anticipated.

Alternative B – No effects anticipated.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

The area occupied by these structures is less than an acre. Few recreational opportunities exist.

Alternative A – No effects anticipated.

Alternative B – No effects anticipated.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to population and housing.

The structures are located on a 40 acre tract of state land managed for agriculture, in a rural setting.

Alternative A – No effects anticipated.

Alternative B – No effects anticipated.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

This is a derelict residential site near a rural community.

Alternative A – Removal of the structures and debris will remain in character with the community.

Alternative B – Not removing the structures and debris will remain out of character with the community.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

This is a derelict residential site near a rural community.

Alternative A – Removal of the structures and debris will remain in character with the community.

Alternative B – Not removing the structures and debris will remain out of character with the community.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

The homesite lease currently provides no income to the Montana Tech Trust.

Alternative A – Removal of the structures and debris will cost between \$10,000 and \$15,000, but will eliminate the liability of the derelict structures; once gone the land will be able to be incorporated back into an agricultural lease.

Alternative B – The site would continue to produce no income for the trust and remain a liability.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Craig Campbell Title: Bozeman Unit Manager	Date: 2/18/2015
----------------------------------	---	------------------------

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative A – Remove the structures and debris from the site.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I have determined that none of the anticipated environmental impacts outlined in the EA are significant according to the criteria outlined in *ARM 36.2.524*. I find that no impacts are regarded as severe, enduring, geographically widespread, or frequent. Further, I find that removing the structures and debris will eliminate a hazard on State Land while making the parcel productive in the future.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Chuck Barone Title: Bozeman Unit Forester
Signature: /s/ Chuck Barone 	Date: February 18, 2015