

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Elm Coulee Lay Flat Hose Project
Proposed Implementation Date:	Summer/Fall 2024
Proponent:	ASWS dba. Hamlin Water Services
Location:	T25N-R54E-Sec 16 & T25N-R53E-Sec 16 (Common Schools Trust)
County:	Richland

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

ASWS dba. Hamlin Water Services, henceforth referred to as the proponent, has requested to temporarily place a 12 inch lay flat upon two separate sections of Montana State Trust land referenced above. This pipeline would be used to provide temporary water for nearby proposed oil well completions. The anticipated length of temporary pipeline on the tract is approximately 2.54 miles. The expected duration of use of this license should be less than 3 months. The proposed license would be written for a term of one year to allow for potential scheduling conflicts.

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 submitted a DS-401 Land Use License (LUL) application with the DNRC Minerals Management Bureau. The Eastern Land Office has been notified of the application.

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

- DNRC Water Resources Division – Beneficial Use Permit

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No Action Alternative: The LUL would be denied, and the proponent would not be allowed to place approximately 16,434.37 feet of a 12-inch waterline upon the Montana State Trust Lands referenced above.

Action Alternative: The LUL would be approved, and the proponent would be allowed to place 16,434.37 feet of a 12-inch waterline on the proposed locations within Montana State Trust Lands referenced above.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO THE PHYSICAL AND HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The impacts analysis identifies and evaluates direct, secondary, and cumulative impacts.

- **Direct impacts:** impacts that occur at the same time and place as the action that causes the impact
- **Secondary impacts:** further impacts to the human environment that may be stimulated, or induced by, or otherwise result from a direct impact of the action.
- **Cumulative impacts:** collective impacts on the human environment of the proposed action when considered in conjunction with other past and present actions related to the proposed action by location or generic type. Related future actions must also be considered when these actions are under concurrent consideration by any state agency through pre-impact statement studies, separate impact study evaluation, or permit processing procedures.

Where impacts are expected to occur, the impacts analysis estimates the duration and severity of the impact.

The duration of an impact is quantified as follows:

- **Short-term:** impacts that would not last longer than the proposed operation of the site, including reclamation of the site.
- **Long-term:** impacts that would remain or occur following reclamation of the proposed site.

The severity of an impact is measured using the following:

- **No impact:** There would be no change from current conditions.
- **Negligible:** An adverse or beneficial effect would occur but would be at the lowest levels of detection.
- **Minor:** The effect would be noticeable but would be relatively small and would not affect the function or integrity of the resource.
- **Moderate:** The effect would be easily identifiable and would change the function or integrity of the resource.
- **Major:** The effect would alter the resource.

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.

Current Conditions:

Geology: Site geology consists of the Fort Union Formation comprising of sandstones and shales.

Soils: According to the USDA's Web Soil Survey, the project areas are comprised of loams and silty clay loams.

These soils exhibit the following properties:

K Factor – The K factor ratings indicate the susceptibility of a soil to sheet and rill erosion by water. The soils present in the project area have a low to medium susceptibility to erosion by water. Ranging in scale from 0.28 to 0.32 on the numerical scale from 0.02 to 0.69.

Soil compactibility risk – Soils found in the project area exhibit a medium to high risk to soil compactibility, 0.48 to a 1.00 on the numerical scale. With 1.00 being the most severe.

Soil restoration potential – Soils found in the project area exhibit a moderate to high potential for soil restoration, being a 0.00 on the numerical scale.

Soil rutting hazard – Soils found in the project area exhibit a 1.00, indicating a severe soil rutting hazard.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary or cumulative impacts to the geology and soil quality, stability and moisture.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The proponent would lay approximately 16434.37 feet of 12-inch flat hose by combination of by hand, truck, and skid steer. The water line would be placed in areas with mild topography and under dry or

frozen conditions. This should mitigate the risk of displacing, compacting, or otherwise impacting the soils beyond the direct areas. Negligible, short-term impacts to geology and soil quality and moisture would be expected from the selection of the action alternative.

Secondary Impacts: There are no secondary impacts expected to geology and soil quality, stability and moisture from the selection of the action alternative.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected to geology and soil quality, stability and moisture from the selection of the action alternative.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to last the duration of the license.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the Land Use License:

- Activities would be conducted when the ground is dry or frozen to reduce potential for rutting.

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.

Current Conditions

Surface Water: Surface water within T25N-53E-Section 16 contains an ephemeral stream which flows through the southeast quarter through a small reservoir. T25N-54E-Section 16 contains three ephemeral drainages in the western half.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to water quality, quantity, and distribution.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The proponent would lay down approximately 16,434.37 feet of 12-inch water line. This requires the proponent to obtain a beneficial use permit for the water source utilization.

Overall, direct impacts to groundwater or surface water in the project area are expected to be negligible and short-term.

Secondary Impacts: There are no secondary impacts expected to surface or ground water quality or quantity, resulting from the selection of the action alternative.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected to surface or ground water quality or quantity, resulting from the selection of the action alternative.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, lasting until the license expiration date.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the Land Use License:

- All equipment utilized in project activities must be regularly maintained and inspected to ensure it is not leaking fluids, spreading noxious weeds or creating an undue fire hazard.
- Water line may not be placed within 25-feet of any ephemeral drainage or reservoir.

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.

Current Conditions

Currently, emission sources in the project area include vehicles travelling on adjacent county roads and from oil and gas operators. Fugitive dust from vehicle travel on other adjacent gravel roads contributes small amounts of airborne particulate matter in the area. Farming activity including plowing may also create seasonal fugitive dust in the area.

Alternatives**No Action Alternative:**

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to air quality.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: Fugitive dust may be generated from project activities such as driving to and from the sites. Air quality could be temporarily affected during activities. The combustion of diesel would release carbon dioxide (CO₂) an estimated 30 gallons of diesel fuel would be used and an estimated 0.306 metric tons of CO₂ released. There are no anticipated long-term effects on air quality.

Secondary Impacts: There are no secondary impacts expected to air quality resulting from the selection of the action alternative.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected to air quality from the selection of the action alternative.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until license expiration.

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.

Current Conditions

According to the Montana Natural Heritage Program the project area is covered by Lowland/Prairie Grasslands which is comprised of the following. Dominated by Needle and thread, little bluestem, threadleaf sedge, prairie sandreed, sand bluestem, and big bluestem. Other species may include bluebunch wheatgrass, sun sedge, and purple threawn.

An inventory of the Montana Natural Heritage Program's Species of Concern database was conducted for the project area. The search yielded no vegetative species of concern.

Alternatives**No Action Alternative:**

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any impact to vegetation.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: Vegetation communities would be affected temporarily by this project. The use of equipment would temporarily disturb some areas of the plant community. This would occur from the vegetation being compacted by equipment. Per the stipulations of the permit, the proponent would be responsible for the management and mitigation of invasive weeds at the project areas.

Secondary Impacts: Secondary impacts may occur in the form of noxious weed propagation from the site. Weed impacts can be mitigated to negligible with proper efforts.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected to vegetation cover, quantity and quality from the selection of the action alternative.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until license expiration.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the permit to test for aggregate:

- The Proponent will be responsible for the management and mitigation of invasive weeds within the project area.

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.

Current Conditions

The proposed project area serves as habitat for a variety of big game, large and small mammals, raptors, and a variety of other birds.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The action alternative would create minor audible and visual disturbances within a short time frame to any animals that may occupy the project area or its surroundings. Similar habitat and forage can be found throughout the surrounding area and could sustain the impacted wildlife species temporarily. Grazing by domestic animals would continue. Impacts to terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats are expected to be short-term and minor.

Secondary Impacts: There are no secondary impacts expected to terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected to terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until license expiration.

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.

Current Conditions

An inventory of the Montana Natural Heritage Program's Species of Concern was completed for the project area. There were no observations of species of concern reported within the project area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impact to terrestrial, avian and aquatic life and habitats.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: There are no species of concern within the project area therefore no direct impacts would be anticipated.

Secondary Impacts: There are no secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: None

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

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

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 results revealed that no cultural or paleontological resources have been identified in the APE, but it should be noted that Class III level inventory work has not been conducted there to date.

Considering the low-impact potential of the proposed project, developments should have No Effect to Antiquities. 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."

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to historical or archaeological sites.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The selection of the action alternative would have no impact to antiquities as defined under the Montana State Antiquities Act.

Secondary Impacts: There are no secondary impacts expected to historical and archaeological sites.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected to historical and archaeological sites.

Duration: No impacts expected.

Mitigations

The potential selection of action alternative would include the following stipulation in the permit to test for aggregate:

- If any cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during project activities, all operations must stop, and the proponent shall contact the DNRC.

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.

Current Conditions

Located approximately 23 miles southwest of Culbertson, MT. Operations may be visible to the occasional passerby and adjacent neighbors.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The selection of the no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impact to aesthetics.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: Recreationists, residents, and motorists in the area would see a skid steer and several trucks in the project areas. The operations are expected to take one to two days. After the laying the flat hose is complete, the water line may be visible by individuals recreating in the project vicinity. Minimal disturbances to aesthetics are expected during operations. However, there are no long-term effects on aesthetics anticipated if the action alternative is selected. Increased noise levels may also occur from the proposed action and expected to be minor and short-term. Noise levels from activities are expected to be like those produced from motorists travelling nearby.

Secondary Impacts: Noise and visual impacts will occur outside of the project area. However, these impacts are expected to be minimal and short-term.

Cumulative Impacts: There are no cumulative impacts expected to aesthetics.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term.

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.

Current Conditions

Water is a limited resources in the project area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to the demands of environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The proposed project may have an impact on water resources within the project area. This project requires a beneficial water use permit from the DNRC Water Resources Division, which regulates the potential impacts from the use of water.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until the expiration of the license.

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.

Current Conditions

The entirety of the project areas has an overlying agriculture and grazing leases, as well as oil and gas leases

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to have direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to other environmental documents or projects pertinent to the area.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The grazing lessees would realize a short-term negligible loss in vegetation within their lease. Upon reclamation the impacted areas would return to native rangeland. The proposed project would be expected to have a positive impact to the oil and gas leases, as this water may be used in the production of oil and gas. Any future development in the area would likely be restricted to utility or mineral development.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until expiration of the license.

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.

Current Conditions

The current condition of the site poses no risk to human health or safety.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to have direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to human health or safety.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The proposed action is expected to have no impacts to human health or safety, other than those typically associated with the associated employee health and safety risks. The project area is in a rural area away from residences.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: No Impacts expected.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

Current Conditions

The project areas are in a rural area where oil and gas, and agriculture are the prominent industries.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative would not be expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impact to industrial, commercial, and agriculture activities and production.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: This project has the potential to have a positive impact to the industrial and commercial activities in the area, being of use in the oil and gas industry. There are no significant impacts expected upon the agriculture activities within the area.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until expiration of the license.

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.

Current Conditions

The closest town and employment center is Culbertson, Montana. The workforce consists mainly of ranchers and oil and gas workers.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impacts to the quantity and distribution of employment.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: No direct impacts are expected to quantity and distribution of employment.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: No impacts expected.

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.

Current Conditions

Trust land is exempt from local property tax. Operators and lessees conducting business on Trust Lands must pay business taxes.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to have any impact on local and state tax bases or tax revenues.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: No direct impacts to local and state tax base and tax revenue are expected from the selection of the action alternative.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: 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

Current Conditions

Emergency services would likely come from Culbertson, MT.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impact on the demand for government services.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The proposed action is not anticipated to have any impact on demand for government services.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: 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.

Current Conditions

There are no known environmental plans or goals for this tract or in the project vicinity.

Alternatives**No Action Alternative:**

Direct Impacts: The no action alternative is not expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impact on locally adopted environmental plans or goals.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: No impacts expected, there are no known zoning or management plans.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until expiration of license.

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.

Current Conditions

The project area is not designated as wilderness, nor does it provide access to wilderness.

Alternatives**No Action Alternative:**

The no action alternative is not expected to have any direct, secondary, or cumulative impact on the access to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The project area does allow for public use. The public recreation on this tract is expected to consist of hunters. Direct impacts to recreationists would be temporary while project activities occur. An increase in noise and visual effects would occur for species in the area that sportsman may be targeting.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until final reclamation.

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.

Current Conditions

The closest major population center to the project area is Culbertson, Montana.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: The no action alternative is not expected to impact the density and distribution of population and housing.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: No direct impacts expected to the density and distribution of population and housing.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: Any impacts would be expected to be short term, until license expiration.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Current Conditions

The Fort Peck Reservation is approximately 30 miles to the northwest of the project area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to have any direct, secondary or cumulative impacts to social structures, native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: No direct impacts expected to native or traditional lifestyles.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: None

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

Current Conditions

There are no known unique qualities of the area.

Alternatives

No Action Alternative:

The no action alternative is not expected to impact cultural uniqueness or diversity.

Action Alternative:

Direct Impacts: No direct impacts expected.

Secondary Impacts: No secondary impacts expected.

Cumulative Impacts: No cumulative impacts expected.

Duration: None

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.

The return to the trust would be a one-time application fee of \$25.00 and a rental charge of fifty cents (0.50) per foot. Approximately 16,434.37 feet of 12-inch lay flat hose would be placed with the referenced Montana State Trust Lands equating to a rental payment due of \$8,217.18 to be paid to the common school trust. Project activities should not impede the existing utilization of State Surface Leases or the Oil and Gas Leases.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Thomas Palin	Date: July 9, 2024
	Title: Mineral Resource Specialist	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Action Alternative

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The granting of the requested Land Use License on Montana State Trust Lands is not expected to result in, nor cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed action satisfies the Trust's fiduciary mandate and accounts for the long-term productivity of the land. An environmental assessment is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action.

I conclude that all identified potential impacts will be mitigated by utilizing permit requirements, including the stipulations listed below.

1. The permit holder shall be in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws, rules, and regulations, including but not limited to those concerning safety, environmental protection, reclamation.
2. If any cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during project activities, all operations must stop, and the proponent shall contact the DNRC.
3. Project activities will be limited to occur only under dry or frozen conditions, to mitigate impacts on soils.
4. All equipment utilized in project activities will be inspected prior to activities to ensure it is not leaking fluids, spreading noxious weeds, or creating an undue fire hazard.
5. The proponent will contact the DNRC at least 48 hours before project activities commence.

6. If any damage to fences is incurred the proponent will fix damages.
7. Water line may not be placed within 25-feet of any ephemeral drainage or reservoir.
8. The Proponent will be responsible for the management and mitigation of invasive weeds within the project area.
9. Every vehicle used in project activities must be equipped with a fire extinguisher.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS
 More Detailed EA
 No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Scott Aye
	Title: ELO Land Program Manager
Signature: /s/ Scott Aye	Date: 7-9-2024

