

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Kinder Morgan Crude Line, Lease AG-3338
Proposed:	Installation of a 4" Crude Oil Pipeline on Lease AG-3338
Implementation Date:	June 2026
Proponent:	Hiland Crude, LLC
Location:	Section 16, Township 28N, Range 58E
County:	Roosevelt
Trust:	Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Hiland Cude LLC, referred to as the Proponent, is applying for a 25' Right of Way Easement (1.44 acres). Kinder Morgan is gathering the crude off the Kraken- Northern Pad that is located approximately 1 mile Northwest of this State Land tract. Kinder Morgan is proposing to install up to a 4-inch steel crude pipeline through State Land to gather the crude and transport it through the proposed pipeline to their existing pipeline facilities.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

The Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC)
Northeastern Land Office (NELO) & Glasgow Unit Office
Proponent: Hiland Crude, LLC
Surface Lessees: Dave Granley
Other:

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

The Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Real Estate Management Bureau has jurisdiction over this proposed project.

The proponent is responsible for acquiring all necessary permits for the proposed project and settling all surface damage with the surface lessees.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A (No Action) – Deny Permission to proponent to install Crude Oil pipeline across School Trust Lands.

Alternative B (the Proposed Action) – Grant Permission to proponent to install the Crude Oil pipeline across School Trust Land.

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 significant impacts to unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources are anticipated, though temporary displacement of local wildlife around the immediate work area may occur during the project. However, if a unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resource is discovered during project related activities, all work will cease until a professional assessment can be made.

Species of Concern occurrences from the Montana NHP include Ferruginous Hawk, Golden eagle, sharp-tailed Grouse, and Western Hog-nosed Snake.

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 revealed that no cultural or paleontological resources have been identified in the APE. No additional archaeological investigative work will be conducted. 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.

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.

No significant impacts on the aesthetics of the area are anticipated.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the number of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

No limited environmental resources will be significantly impacted because of this project. This project will also not add any significant cumulative demands to environmental resources.

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.

There is an LUL application for a temporary workspace during the installation of the pipeline, and neither of these applications are likely to have significant impacts.

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 proposed project does not include any changes to housing or developments.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

There is no native, unique or traditional lifestyles or communities in the vicinity that would be significantly impacted by the proposal.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

The proposed project will have no significant impact on any culturally unique quality of the area.

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 proposed project will not have any significant cumulative economic or social effect.

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative B (the Proposed Action) – Under this alternative, it is recommended that the proponent be granted permission to install this pipeline across School Trust Land.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I have evaluated the potential environmental effects and have determined no significant impact on the environment because of this project.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Tanner Roness
	Title: Land Use Specialist, Glasgow Unit
Signature:	Date: 4/28/2020

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Don Pyrah
	Title: Unit Manager, Glasgow Unit Office
Signature:	Date: 4/28/2020