

Environmental Assessment Checklist

Project Name: Fish Creek Fishing Access Site Blowdown

Proposed Implementation Date: Spring 2026

Proponent: Missoula Unit, Southwestern Land Office, Montana DNRC

County: Missoula

Type and Purpose of Action

Description of Proposed Action:

A wind event impacted two areas leased by Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks (FWP) for fishing access sites (FAS). FWP would like to remove windthrown material (blowdown) to ensure the public can continue to use the sites.

Beneficiary	Legal Description	Total Acres	Treated Acres
Common Schools	Section 36 T14N R25W	560	5
Capitol Buildings	Section 8 T14N R24W	160	19
MSU 2 nd Grant			
MSU Morrill			
Eastern College-MSU/Western College-U of M			
Montana Tech			
University of Montana			
School for the Deaf and Blind			
Pine Hills School			
Veterans Home			
Public Land Trust			
Acquired Land			

Blowdown removal will be scattered throughout the easement area. It IS NOT a continuous area of blowdown.

Objectives of the projects include:

- Clean up blowdown in two fishing access sites

Proposed activities include:

Action	Quantity
Proposed Harvest Activities	
Clearcut	
Seed Tree	
Shelterwood	
Selection	

Action	Quantity
Commercial Thinning	
Salvage	24
Sanitation	
Total Treatment Acres	
Proposed Forest Improvement Treatment	
Pre-commercial Thinning	
Planting	
Proposed Road Activities	
New permanent road construction	
New temporary road construction	
Road maintenance	
Road reconstruction	
Road abandoned	
Road reclaimed	
Other Activities	

Duration of Activities:	1-5 months
Implementation Period:	2026

The lands involved in this proposed project are held in trust by the State of Montana. (Enabling Act of February 22, 1889; 1972 Montana Constitution, Article X, Section 11). The Board of Land Commissioners and the DNRC are required by law to administer these trust lands to produce the largest measure of reasonable and legitimate return over the long run for the beneficiary institutions (Section 77-1-202, MCA).

The DNRC would manage lands involved in this project in accordance with:

- The State Forest Land Management Plan (DNRC 1996),
- Administrative Rules for Forest Management (ARM 36.11.401 through 471),
- The Montana DNRC Forested State Trust Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) (DNRC 2010)
- all other applicable state and federal laws.

Project Development

SCOPING:

DNRC specialists were consulted, including Mike Anderson-Fisheries biologist and Garrett Schairer-Wildlife Biologist. FWP recreation staff were also consulted.

Issues and concerns were incorporated into project planning and design and would be implemented in associated contracts.

OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS

NEEDED: *(Conservation Easements, Army Corps of Engineers, road use permits, etc.)*

- **Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)-** DNRC is classified as a major open burner by DEQ and is issued a permit from DEQ to conduct burning activities on state lands managed by DNRC. As a major open-burning permit holder, DNRC agrees to comply with the limitations and conditions of the permit.
- **Montana/Idaho Airshed Group-** The DNRC is a member of the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group which was formed to minimize or prevent smoke impacts while using fire to accomplish land management objectives and/or fuel hazard reduction (Montana/Idaho Airshed Group 2006). The Group determines the delineation of airsheds and impact zones throughout Idaho and Montana. Airsheds describe those geographical areas that have similar atmospheric conditions, while impact zones describe any area in Montana or Idaho that the Group deems smoke sensitive and/or having an existing air quality problem (Montana/Idaho Airshed Group 2006). As a member of the Airshed Group, DNRC agrees to burn only on days approved for good smoke dispersion as determined by the Smoke Management Unit.
- **United States Fish & Wildlife Service-** DNRC is managing the habitats of threatened and endangered species on this project by implementing the Montana DNRC Forested Trust Lands HCP and the associated Incidental Take Permit that was issued by the United States Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) in February of 2012 under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act. The HCP identifies specific conservation strategies for managing the habitats of grizzly bear, Canada lynx, and three fish species: bull trout, westslope cutthroat trout, and Columbia redband trout. This project complies with the HCP. The HCP can be found at www.dnrc.mt.gov/HCP.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No-Action: DNRC would not allow FWP to clean up blowdown and areas within the access sites would no longer be available to the public because of the debris.

Action Alternative (Provide a brief description of all proposed activities): The DNRC would allow FWP to clean up blowdown and restore the fishing access site to a condition similar to what existed prior to the blowdown event. Merchantable timber would be decked for the DNRC to sell. Slash would be dispersed within the treated area (lop and scattered) or piled outside the FAS.

Impacts on the Physical Environment

Evaluation of the impacts of the No-Action and Action Alternatives including **direct, secondary, and cumulative** impacts on the Physical Environment.

VEGETATION:

Vegetation	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
No-Action														
Noxious Weeds	X					X				X				
Rare Plants	X				X				X					
Vegetative community	X					X				X				
Old Growth	X				X				X					
Action														
Noxious Weeds		X				X				X				
Rare Plants	x				x				X					
Vegetative community		X				X				X				1
Old Growth	X				X				X					

Comments:

The following species and number of trees blew over:
12-16 cottonwood trees and 1 Douglas-fir-Big Pine FAS
12-15 ponderosa pine-Forks FAS

No other trees would be removed during clean-up operations.

SOIL DISTURBANCE AND PRODUCTIVITY:

Soil Disturbance and Productivity Existing Conditions:

Mineral County soil surveys were accessed from NRCS data sources (2025) and were used to evaluate relative risk of soil erosion, displacement, and compaction based on the proposed actions described in the Type and Purpose of Action.

Soil Map Unit	Map Unit Name	Soil Description	Erosion	Displacement	Compaction
10UA	Beehive-Moosehead Kawuneeche families	Deep, poorly- moderately drained soils, found on alluvial plains and stream terraces	Moderate	Severe	Moderate
13UA	Combest and Kadygulch families	High stream terraces and escarpments	Moderate	Severe	Moderate
13UB	Mitten-Holloway families	High stream terraces and escarpments	Moderate	Severe	Moderate

Soil Disturbance and Productivity	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
No-Action														
Physical Disturbance (Compaction and Displacement)		X			X					X			Y	1
Erosion	X				X				X					
Nutrient Cycling	X				X				X					
Slope Stability	X				X				X					
Soil Productivity	X				x				X					
Action														
Physical Disturbance (Compaction and Displacement)		X				X				X			Y	2, 3
Erosion		X				X				X			Y	3
Nutrient Cycling	X				X				X					
Slope Stability	X				X				X					
Soil Productivity	X				X				X					

Comments:

1. Soil compaction on existing roads in the project area is expected to exceed natural conditions due to public use of campground roads and campsites adjacent to West Fork Fish and Fish creeks.
2. Operate equipment from existing road prisms. Where salvage logs extend toward the wetted channel of West Fork Fish Creek, fully suspend trees to the extent practicable to minimize soil disturbance and displacement. Dispose of slash outside of the SMZ.
3. Where tree root wads are removed, grade root wad well to match adjacent topography and grass seed with native grass mix.

Soil Mitigations:

- Fully suspend stems when salvaging trees adjacent to West Fork Fish Creek to minimize dragging through the terrace.

WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY:

Water Quality and Quantity Existing Conditions:

- This project would occur in portions of the Upper Fish Creek (170102040506) and Lower Fish Creek (170102040602) watersheds.
- West Fork Fish Creek and Fish Creek are perennial, fish-bearing streams in the project area.

- All waters in the project area are Class B-1 waters classified as suitable for drinking, culinary, and food processing purposes after conventional treatment; bathing, swimming and recreation; growth and propagation of salmonid fishes and associated aquatic life, waterfowl and furbearers; and agricultural and industrial water supply.

Water Quality & Quantity	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
No-Action														
Water Quality	X				X				X					
Water Quantity	X				X				X					
Action														
Water Quality		X				X				X			Y	1,2
Water Quantity	X				X				X				N/A	3

Water Quality & Quantity Comments and Mitigations:

1. Fully suspend salvaged logs when removing them from the terrace of West Fork Fish Creek.
2. Grade all areas where root wads would be removed and apply grass seed to minimize sediment delivery to West Fork Fish Creek.
3. No measurable change in the timing, magnitude or duration of the annual hydrograph would be expected through implementation of the Action Alternative

Fisheries	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
No Action														
Sediment		X			X				X				y	1
Flow Regimes	X				X				X					
Woody Debris	X				X				X					
Stream Shading	X				X				X					
Stream Temperature	X				X				X					
Connectivity	X				X				X					
Populations	X				X				X					
Action														
Sediment		X			X				X				y	1
Flow Regimes	X				X				X					
Woody Debris	X				X				X					
Stream Shading	X				X				X					
Stream Temperature	X				X				X					
Connectivity	X				X				X					
Populations	X				X				X					

Comments:

There are no fish bearing streams within the treatment area.

Fisheries Mitigations:

1. The Montana Administrative Rules for Forest Management; Watershed Management and watershed RMS would be implemented. BMPs would be implemented on all roads and within the unit. Slash from the lop-and-scatter thinning process would be left in the unit.

WILDLIFE:

Wildlife Existing Conditions: The project area is a mix of forested Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine stands, riparian cottonwood stands, and shrub and herbaceous riparian areas. Grizzly bears may use the vicinity of the project area during the non-denning period. Some potentially suitable cottonwood riparian habitats exist in the project area, but no observations of yellow-billed cuckoos in the recent past have occurred in the vicinity. Bald eagles could use the project area, but the project area is outside of known bald eagle territories. Potential habitat exists for flammulated owls, fringed myotis, northern hoary bats, and pileated woodpeckers in the project area. Big game summer range as well as elk winter range exist in the project area.

No-Action: No potential for disturbance to wildlife would be anticipated. No timber management or associated activities would be conducted, thus no appreciable changes to existing habitats would occur. Potential loss of coarse woody debris would continue to be a potential given the levels of motorized access and recreational use. Generally, negligible direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to wildlife would occur.

Action Alternative (see Wildlife table below): Species using snags and coarse woody debris would see a reduction in available habitats, while species relying on more open stands would see a slight increase in available habitats. Negligible further changes in landscape connectivity along riparian areas and SMZ corridors would occur. Short-term increases in disturbance potential would occur, but overall, a negligible increase in potential human disturbance would be anticipated following proposed treatments. No changes in legal motorized public access would occur in the project area. Contract stipulations would minimize the presence of human-related attractants for the duration of the proposed activities. Generally, given the size of the area, and the expected changes to habitats, negligible direct, indirect, or cumulative effects would be anticipated.

Wildlife	Impact												Can Impact be Mitigated ?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
Threatened and Endangered Species														
Grizzly Bear (Ursus arctos) Habitat: Recovery areas, security from human activity	X					X				X			Y	1
Lynx (Felis lynx) Habitat: mosaics--dense sapling and	X				X				X					2

Wildlife	Impact												Can Impact be Mitigated ?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
old forest >5,000 ft. elev.														
Yellow-billed cuckoo (<i>Coccyzus americanus</i>) Habitat: open cottonwood riparian forest with dense brush understories (Missoula and Ravalli counties)	X					X				X			Y	3
Wolverine (Gulo gulo) Habitat: Alpine tundra and high-elevation boreal forests that maintain deep persistent snow into late spring	X				X				X					2
Sensitive Species														
Bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>) Habitat: Late-successional forest within 1 mile of open water		X				X				X			Y	4
Black-backed woodpecker (<i>Picoides arcticus</i>) Habitat: Mature to old burned or beetle-infested forest	X				X				X					2
Fisher (<i>Martes pennanti</i>) Habitat: Dense mature to old forest less than 6,000 feet	X				X				X					2

Wildlife	Impact												Can Impact be Mitigated ?	Commen t Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
in elevation and riparian														
Flammulated owl <i>(Otus flammeolus)</i> Habitat: Late- successional ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir forest	X					X				X			Y	5
Peregrine falcon <i>(Falco peregrinus)</i> Habitat: Cliff features near open foraging areas and/or wetlands	X				X				X					2
Pileated woodpecker <i>(Dryocopus pileatus)</i> Habitat: Late- successional ponderosa pine and larch-fir forest	X					X				X				6
Fringed myotis <i>(Myotis thysanodes)</i> Habitat: low elevation ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir and riparian forest with diverse roost sites including outcrops, caves, mines	X					X				X			Y	7
Hoary bat <i>(Lasiurus cinereus)</i> Habitat: coniferous and deciduous forests and roost on foliage in trees,	X					X				X			Y	7

Wildlife	Impact												Can Impact be Mitigated ?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
under bark, in snags, bridges														
Townsend's big-eared bat (Plecotus townsendii) Habitat: caves, caverns, old mines	X				X				X					2
Big Game Species														
Elk		X				X				X			Y	8
Whitetail		X				X				X			Y	8
Mule Deer		X				X				X			Y	8
Moose		X				X				X			Y	8
Bighorn Sheep	X				X				X					
Other														

Comments:

1 The proposed project area is outside of any grizzly bear recovery zone or “occupied habitat” area as mapped by grizzly bear researchers and managers to address increased sightings and encounters of grizzly bears in habitats outside of recovery zones (Wittinger 2002). Grizzly bears have been infrequently documented in the Bitterroot River drainage to the east of the project area and in the Clark Fork River drainage to the north of the project area. Individual animals could use the project area throughout the non-denning period as the population continues to expand south of the NCDE recovery area. However, considerable disturbance in the vicinity associated with human recreation and other human activities in the immediate area where salvage activities would occur likely limits use of these areas by grizzly bears. Proposed activities would occur during the late winter when grizzly bears would not be expected to be using the project area, thus potential disturbance would not be anticipated. Negligible reductions in hiding cover in the small area would be anticipated, but no changes in human access or potential for illegal mortality to grizzly bears would be anticipated. Thus, negligible direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to grizzly bears would be anticipated.

2. The project area is either out of the range of the normal distribution for this species or suitable habitat is not present. Thus, no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects would be anticipated.

3. Some potentially suitable open cottonwood riparian habitats occur along the Clark Fork River, Fish Creek, and the West Fork of Fish Creek. Recent or historical observations of yellow-billed cuckoos in the vicinity of the Project Area are lacking (MNHP 2025). Proposed activities would occur outside of the time periods when yellow-billed cuckoos could be in Montana, thus potential for disturbance to yellow-billed cuckoos would not be anticipated. Proposed removal of wind thrown or broken cottonwood trees would not appreciably alter nesting habitats.

Generally, a low risk of adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to yellow-billed cuckoos would be anticipated with the proposed activities.

4. The project area outside of known bald eagle territories in the vicinity. Given the proximity to Fish Creek and the West Fork of Fish Creek and associated wetlands, use of the project area by bald eagles could occur. Proposed activities could introduce additional disturbance to bald eagles in the vicinity with activities that would occur during the early portion of the nesting season, but overall negligible effects to the nesting pair would occur since proposed activities would occur along open roads, near existing forms of human disturbance, and would occur rather distant from the known nest in the vicinity. Generally, the salvage of windthrown and broken trees would not appreciably affect bald eagle habitats; removal of any green trees could reduce availability of perch trees, but ample amounts of perch trees would exist in the project area. Generally, should a nest be detected closer to the project area, additional mitigations would be developed to minimize the potential for disturbance to nesting bald eagles. Thus, a low risk of adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to bald eagles would be anticipated with the proposed activities.

5. Some potential flammulated owl habitats are present in the project area. Proposed activities would occur outside of the flammulated owl nesting season, so no disturbance of flammulated owls would be anticipated. Proposed activities would salvage blowdown trees that may be suitable for foraging but have already lost potential for nesting; any salvage of broken or green trees could further reduce nesting substrates or foraging habitats. Retention of large ponderosa pine and large snags could facilitate flammulated owl use into the future. Overall, a low risk of adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to flammulated owls would be anticipated with the proposed activities.

6. Potential pileated woodpecker habitats exist in the proposed project area. Proposed salvage activities would occur outside of the pileated woodpecker nesting season so no disturbance to pileated woodpeckers would be anticipated. Proposed salvage would reduce coarse woody debris and any damaged green trees. Overall, the wind event has already reduced the quality of these stands for pileated woodpeckers and the proposed salvage would reduce some foraging substrates, but would have minimal effects to potential nesting habitats. Retention of some large trees and large snags would meet minimum ARM commitments and would provide for snag dependent species. Overall negligible direct, indirect, or cumulative effects would be anticipated to pileated woodpeckers.

7. Potential habitats for northern hoary bat and fringed myotis likely exist in the project area given the habitats present along with the proximity to Fish Creek, West Fork of Fish Creek, and numerous other smaller streams and wetlands. Both have been documented in the vicinity. Proposed activities would occur when neither species would be expected to be active in the project area, thus no potential for disturbance to either species would be anticipated. Proposed activities could reduce potential foraging substrates and maybe potential roosting habitats should broken or green trees be removed but considerable trees would persist that could be used for foraging or roosting. Overall, a low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to northern hoary bats or fringed myotis would be anticipated.

8. The proposed project area likely serves as white-tailed deer, elk, and moose winter range; winter ranges for the other big game species do not occur in the project area. Summer use by deer, elk, and moose is possible. No big game security habitats occur in the vicinity of proposed activities. Slight increases in potential disturbance to wintering big game would be possible, but proposer activities would occur along open roads and near other forms of human disturbance, thus negligible additional disturbance to wintering big game species would be expected. No appreciable changes to thermal cover would be anticipated given the nature of proposed

salvage. Proposed activities could alter minor amounts of hiding cover, but would not appreciably alter big game survival in the area. Overall, negligible direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to big game would be anticipated.

Wildlife Mitigations:

- A DNRC biologist will be consulted if a threatened or endangered species is encountered to determine if additional mitigations that are consistent with the administrative rules for managing threatened and endangered species (ARM 36.11.428 through 36.11.435) are needed.
- Snags, snag recruits, and coarse woody debris will be managed according to *ARM 36.11.411* through *36.11.414*, where feasible and would not be at risk of potential firewood gathering activities associated with human recreation.
- Contractors and purchasers conducting contract operations will be prohibited from carrying firearms while on duty.
- Food, garbage, and other attractants will be stored in a bear-resistant manner.
- Should a raptor nest be identified in or near project activities, activities will cease and a DNRC biologist will be contacted. Site-specific measures will be developed and implemented to protect the nest and birds prior to re-starting activities.
- Complete activities during the winter to reduce potential disturbance to grizzly bears, flammulated owls, pileated woodpeckers, fringed myotis, and northern hoary bats.

Wildlife References

Wittinger, W.T. 2002. Grizzly bear distribution outside of recovery zones. Unpublished memorandum on file at USDA Forest Service, Region 1. Missoula, Montana.2pp.

AIR QUALITY:

Air Quality	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
No-Action														
Smoke	X				x				X					
Dust	x				X				X					
Action														
Smoke		X			X				x				y	1
Dust		X			x				X				y	2

Comments:

Under the Action Alternative, slash piles consisting of tree limbs and tops and other vegetative debris would be created. These slash piles would ultimately be burned after clean-up operations have been completed.

Dust may be produced along the haul route if wood is hauled during summer months.

Air Quality Mitigations:

- *The DNRC, as a member of the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group, would burn only on approved days.*
- *Because of the small project area, hauling would be short in duration.*

Will the No-Action or Action Alternatives result in potential impacts to:	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
No-Action														
Historical or Archaeological Sites	X				X				x					
Aesthetics		X			X				X					
Demands on Environmental Resources of Land, Water, or Energy	X				x				X					
Action														
Historical or Archaeological Sites	X				X				X					
Aesthetics		X			X					X			Y	1
Demands on Environmental Resources of Land, Water, or Energy	X				X				X					

Comments:

1. The wind event caused changes to the aesthetics in both FAS. The canopy is now more open and currently blowdown is littered across both fishing access sites.

Mitigations:

- Blowdown would be cleaned up at both Fishing Access Sites under the Action Alternative.

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.*

- FWP completed a categorical exclusion for the same activity.

Impacts on the Human Population

Evaluation of the impacts on the proposed action including **direct, secondary, and cumulative** impacts on the Human Population.

Fish Creek FAS Blowdown
Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation

Will the No-Action or Action Alternatives result in potential impacts to:	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
No-Action														
Health and Human Safety	x				x				x					
Industrial, Commercial and Agricultural Activities and Production	x				x				x					
Quantity and Distribution of Employment	x				x				x					
Local Tax Base and Tax Revenues	x				x				x					
Demand for Government Services	x				x				x					
Access To and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities	x				x				x					
Density and Distribution of population and housing	x				x				x					
Social Structures and Mores	x				x				x					
Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity	x				x				x					
Action														
Health and Human Safety	x				x				x					
Industrial, Commercial and Agricultural Activities and Production	x				x				x					
Quantity and Distribution of Employment		x			x				x				N/A	1
Local Tax Base and Tax Revenues	x				x				x					
Demand for Government Services	x				x				x					
Access To and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities	x				x				x					
Density and Distribution of population and housing	x				x				x					
Social Structures and Mores	x				x				x					

Will the No-Action or Action Alternatives result in potential impacts to:	Impact												Can Impact Be Mitigated?	Comment Number
	Direct				Secondary				Cumulative					
	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High	No	Low	Mod	High		
Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity	X				X				x					

Comments:

1. The project size is of a scale that would not have a large effect on local employment; however each unit may provide a private contractor with 1-3 months of employment for his/herself and his/her employees.

Mitigations:

N/A

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.*
None

Other Appropriate Social and Economic Circumstances:

No Action: Blowdown would remain on site with no potential to generate revenue.

Action: DNRC retained timber rights on both fishing access sites. Merchantable timber would be decked by FWP and their contractor and the DNRC would seek a buyer and the revenue generated would go to the associated DNRC trust beneficiary.

References

DNRC 1996. State forest land management plan: final environmental impact statement (and appendixes). Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Forest Management Bureau, Missoula, Montana.

DNRC. 2010. Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation Forested State Trust Lands Habitat Conservation Plan: Final EIS, Volume II, Forest Management Bureau, Missoula, Montana.

Does the proposed action involve potential risks or adverse effects that are uncertain but extremely harmful if they were to occur?

NO

Does the proposed action have impacts that are individually minor, but cumulatively significant or potentially significant?

NO

Environmental Assessment Checklist Prepared By:

Name: Amy Helena

Title: Missoula Unit Manager
Date: 2/18/2026

Finding

Alternative Selected

The Action Alternative

Significance of Potential Impacts

The Action Alternative meets the specific Objectives of the Proposed Action as described on page 1 of the EA. The Action Alternative includes mitigation activities to address environmental concerns identified during the project analysis

Need for Further Environmental Analysis

☐

EIS

☐

More Detailed EA

☒

No Further Analysis

Environmental Assessment Checklist Approved By:

Name: Scott Allen

Title: Trust Lands Forest Management Supervisor

Date: February 19, 2026

Signature: *Scott Allen*

Attachment A- Maps

A-1: Vicinity Map





