CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:

Triangle Communications Joplin Fiber Optic Cable

Proposed

Implementation Date: May- August 2026

Proponent:

Triangle Telephone Cooperative Association, Inc.

Location:

E2NE4 Sec. 09, T31N R08E

County:

Hill

Trust:

Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Triangle Telephone Cooperative Association, Inc. (TTCA, Inc.) is proposing to extend fiber optic telecommunication in their Joplin exchange. The most direct route includes crossing School Trust Land, located at E2NE4 Sec. 09, T31N R08E. TTCA Inc. has requested a 20-foot-wide easement which will run 2345.88 feet, following the county road right of way. The project will encompass a total of 1.08 acres of School Trust Land.

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 Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC)

Northeastern Land Office (NELO) & Lewistown Unit Office

Proponent: Triangle Telephone Cooperative Association, Inc.

Surface Lessees: Allan Han, Dana Phillips

Other: Patrick Rennie (DNRC Archaeologist),

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

The DNRC, and NELO have jurisdiction over this proposed project.

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

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A (No Action) – Under this alternative, the Department does not grant TTCA, Inc. the requested Right of Way Easement.

Alternative B (the Proposed Action) – Under this alternative, the Department does grant TTCA, Inc. the requested Right of Way Easement across E2NE4 Sec. 09, T31N R08E for installation of buried fiber optic communication cable.

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.

All soil types in the project area are rated as somewhat limited for shallow excavations, due to instability when trenched into and being dusty. This should not be an issue because a trenchless installation method will be used. This method involves using a ripper on the back of a bulldozer that drops the cable and conduit in as it goes, thus negating the possible negative impacts associated with the soil characteristics.

The most limiting soil characteristic in the project area is rutting hazard. Soils are rated as severe for rutting hazards, when exposed to equipment operation. To mitigate this hazard, operations will be restricted to dry periods when the soil is most stable.

All soils along the project route are listed as slight for erosion hazard. Since all projects are occurring in previously disturbed areas with established erosion control vegetation, the minimal ground disturbance caused by the trenchless installation method will limit possible erosion issues.

All applicable soil ratings can be seen in Appendix A. No significant cumulative impacts to geology or soil quality, stability, and moisture are anticipated.

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.

No significant impacts to local or regional water resources are anticipated.

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.

No significant impacts to air quality are anticipated.

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.

All easements are located within the current road ROWs that are already dominated by introduced species such as smooth brome and crested wheatgrass. Since the method of installation is trenchless there will be very little soil disturbance allowing the introduced grasses to quickly revegetate.

If re-seeding is necessary the proponent will acquire certified, weed free seed and refer to the Plant Materials Tech Note No. MT-46 (Rev. 4) dated September 2013 for seeding rates. See Appendix B for additional seeding details.

No rare plants or cover types are present. No significant impacts to vegetation are anticipated.

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.

No significant impacts to terrestrial, avian, or aquatic habitats are anticipated.

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.

Native Species


USutable (introduced range)

Non-native Historical (1001m-10 000m)

Summarized by: SOC Report (Custom Area of Interest)

Filtered by:

Native Species reports are filtered for Species with MT Status = Species of Concern, Special Status, Important Animal Habitat, Potential SOC



Species Occurrences

No Species were found for the filters selected

All easement areas are adjacent to existing disturbances with frequent human use, mostly roads, as such the habitat is already disturbed and the most common impact for species will be temporary displacement.

No significant impacts to unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources are anticipated, though temporary displacement of local wildlife may occur during the project.

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 *Antiquities* have not been identified in the APE. 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.

No significant effects on historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources 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 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 amount 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 are no other projects or plans being considered on the tracts listed in this EA Checklist.

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.

The only risk to human health and safety would be during the construction of the project. It would be the responsibility of the proponent to mitigate any risks during construction. After construction there will be some health and safety benefits provided by increased internet access. The better internet will allow residents of the area to have better access to telehealth and phone service for better communication with emergency services.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

The resulting broadband internet access from these easements could potentially provide recipients with the ability to use E-commerce for more profitable operations and better marketing of agricultural products. However, all benefits to industry, commerce, and agriculture are incidental and not a direct result of the easements.

This project will not add to or deter from other industrial, agricultural, or commercial activities in the area.

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.

These easements would not directly create any jobs but may indirectly create opportunities for employment for the end users of the internet. With the current trend for more teleworking having high quality broadband internet would create possible opportunities for end users to access teleworking labor markets that are currently inaccessible.

The project will not create or eliminate any jobs, so no significant effects to the employment market are anticipated.

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.

There are no direct or cumulative effects to taxes or revenue for the proposed project.

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

There will not be any significant increases in traffic, school attendance, or need for fire and police protection if this project is approved.

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 zoning or other agency management plans affecting this project.

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.

There will be no significant direct or cumulative effects on access to or quality of recreation and wilderness activities because of this project.

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 are 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.

100 September 408	us in Copylis by Ita	V. FIND	ING	t experiment make the for the present affil
25. ALTERNATIVE S	ELECTED:			
Alternative B (the Propersion of the Propersion	oosed Acti peroptic cal	on) – Under this alterna oles	tive, the Depa	artment does grant the requested
26. SIGNIFICANCE O	F POTENT	TIAL IMPACTS:		
I have evaluated the pobecause of this project.	tential envi	ronment effects and have	e determined	no significant impact to the environmen
27. NEED FOR FURT	HER ENVI	RONMENTAL ANALYS	IS:	
EIS		More Detailed EA	X	No Further Analysis
EA Checklist Prepared By:	l	Cole Stumpf Land Use Specialist		
Signature:	ole (. Shryp!	Date	: 15 Dec. 7025
EA Checklist	Name:	Josh Stoychoff		
Approved By:	Title:	Unit Manager, Northe	eastern Land	Office
Signature:	Lath &	mireland	1	Date: 12/15/25

Appendix A: Soils Data

E2NE4 Sec. 09, T31N R08E

			Summary by Map Unit — Hill Cou	nty, Montana (MTQ41)		
Summary by Map Unit	- Hill County, Montai	na (MT041)				G
Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Component name (percent)	Rating reasons (numeric values)	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
Totals for Area of Int	tals for Area of Interest			834.8	100.0%	
Table — Shallow Excavatio	ns — Summary by Ratio	ng Value				
Table — Shallow Excavation	ns — Summary by Ratio	ng Value		Physical Section 1990 Co.		
		ng Value	Summary by Ratin	g Value		
	lue		Summary by Ratin	g Value		8
	lue	ng Value Rating	Summary by Ratin	g Value Acres in AOI	Percent of	(8)
Table — Shallow Excavation Summary by Rating Va Somewhat limited	lue		Summary by Ratin		Percent of	(8)

	Sum	mary by Man II	nit — Hill County, Montana (MTO-	11)		
Summary by Map	Unit — Hill County, Montana (MT041)	mary by riap o	ant - Inn County, Montana (MIC			(a)
Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Component name (percent)	Rating reasons (numeric values)	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
334B Phillips-Ket	Phillips-Kevin complex, 0 to 4 percent slopes	Severe	Phillips (50%)	Low strength (1.00)	388.2	81.5%
			Kevin (35%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Hillon (5%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Elloam (4%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Nishon (2%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Ethridge (2%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Thoeny (2%)	Low strength (1.00)		
561B Scobey-Kevin clay	cobey-Kevin clay loams, 0 to 4 percent slopes	s Severe	Scobey (50%)	Low strength (1.00)	88.4	18.5%
			Kevin (35%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Hillon (8%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Elloam (3%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Nishon (2%)	Low strength (1.00)		
			Acel (2%)	Low strength (1.00)		
Totals for Area	of Interest			476.5	100.0%	
able — Soil Rutting	Hazard — Summary by Rating Value			Was Commission of the Commission		
		Sumi	mary by Rating Value			
Summary by Rati	ng Value					(8
_	Rating		Acr	es in AOI	Percent of AOI	
Severe				476.5		100.0%
Totals for Area	of Interest			476.5		100.0%

			Summary by Map Unit - Hill Cou	nty, Montana (MTO41)		
Summary by Map Unit	 Hill County, Monta 	na (MT041)				(3)
Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Component name (percent)	Rating reasons (numeric values)	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
Totals for Area of In	terest				834.8	100.0%
			Summary by Ratin	g Value		
Summary by Rating Va	lue		, ,	7		(2)
Rating			Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI		
Slight			834.8	834.8		
Totals for Area of Interest			834.8		100.0%	

Appendix B: Seeding Recommendation

Species	Percent
Sandberg Bluegrass	25%
slender wheatgrass	30%
Prairie Junegrass	15%
Needle and Thread	15%
Lewis blue flax or	

- Native Mix
- Certified Noxious Weed Seed Free
- Drill seeding rate of 6 lbs/acre Pure Live Seed (PLS)
- Seed poundage should be doubled and harrowed if the area is broadcast seeded
- Seeding shall occur in the fall (after September 15) or early spring (before May 1).

Appendix C: Project Map

E2NE4 Sec. 09, T31N R08E

