

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Eastern Land Office Land Banking 2014
Proposed Implementation Date: 2014
Proponent: Burl & Shemene Peckman
Location: T15N R41E S14
County: Garfield

Sale 719

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Offer for Sale at Public Auction, 320 acres of state land currently held in trust for the benefit of Public Schools. Revenue from the sale would be deposited in a special account used to purchase replacement lands meeting acquisition criteria related to legal access, productivity, potential income and proximity to existing state ownership which would then be held in trust for the benefit of Public Schools. The proposed sale is part of a program called Land Banking authorized by the 2003 Legislature. The purpose of the program is for the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation to overall, diversify uses of land holdings of the various trusts, improve the sustained rate of return to the trusts, improve access to state trust land and consolidate ownership.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

- A letter was distributed in September 2004 to all state surface lessees informing them of the Land Banking Program and requesting nominations.
- Legal notices were published in the Jordan Tribune in July, 2014.
- Direct mailings were made to lessees, adjacent landowners, County Commissioners and other concerned parties. Comments were received from Montana Dept. of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, and Montana Dept. of Transportation.
- Follow-up contacts were made by phone and mail with parties requesting additional information.
- The tracts were also posted on the DNRC web page at:
<http://dnrc.mt.gov/TLMSPublic/LandBanking/LBTest.aspx>

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

None

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A- No action, under this alternative the state would retain existing land ownership pattern and would not sell the tract of land.

Alternative B- Under this alternative, the Department would request and recommend approval by the Land Board to sell the proposed land locked tract. If approved by the board, the sale would be at public auction. The income from the sale would be pooled with other land sale receipts from across the state to fund the purchase of other state land, easements, or improvements for the beneficiaries of the respective trusts.

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.

Alternative A- No Impact

Alternative B- The land is currently being grazed if sold the land will be used as a grazing tract with minimal disturbance occurring.

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.

Alternative- A No Impact Expected.

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected- Water rights associated with this tract will transfer with the proposed sale. Other water quality and/or quantity issue will not be impacted by the proposed action.

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.

Pollutant and particulate levels are currently normal for the area; no increases in these levels are expected. The proposal does not include an on the ground activities, or changes to activities. Tract does not have any air quality regulations or zones.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

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.

The range site on this tract is considered to have average production with thin silty to shallow range sites. Species composition is dominated by grasses which include Western Wheatgrass (*Agropyron smithii*), Green Needlegrass (*Stipa viridula*), Bluebunch Wheatgrass (*Agropyron spicatum*), Prairie Sandreed (*Calamovilfa longifolia*), Prairie Junegrass (*Koeleria pyramidata*), Threadleaf Sedge (*Carex filifolia*), Six Week Fescue (*Vulpia octoflora*), Sandberg Bluegrass (*Poa secunda*), Needle and Thread (*Stipa comata*) and Blue Grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*). Sub-dominate species include various forbs and woody species.

Vegetation may be affected by numerous land management activities including livestock grazing, development or wildlife management. It is unknown what land use activities may be associated with a change in ownership; however the vegetation on this tract is typical of land throughout the vicinity and there are no known rare, unique cover types or vegetation on the tract. It is expected that this tract will be used for grazing livestock in the future. The proposal does not include any on the ground activities or changes to activities and therefore we do not expect any direct or cumulative effects would occur to vegetation as a result of this proposal.

Alternative A- No Impact Expected

Alternative B- No Impact Expected- A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Database reveals that there are no rare plant species or cover types within the tracts mentioned.

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.

The parcel of state trust land is used by a variety of wildlife species typical of undeveloped lands throughout the county. Wildlife populations can be affected by land use activities associated with livestock grazing, residential development or agricultural practices. The area provides habitat for a variety of big game species (mule deer, whitetail deer, and pronghorn antelope), predators (coyote, fox, and badger), upland game birds, other non-game mammals, raptors and various songbirds. Wildlife use on this section is not seasonal in nature.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

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.

A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Database shows that the Great Blue Heron and the Northern Leopard Frog are species of concern that have been observed in the general area of this land banking parcel. This parcel is a grazing tract and that is not expected to change with a potential land sale.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

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

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

No *Antiquities*, as defined under the Montana State Historic Preservation Act, were identified. A tract review was done by DNRC Staff Archaeologist, Patrick Rennie. See attachment for comments on tract.

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.

This tract is located in a rural area of Garfield County. The state land does not provide any unique scenic qualities not also provided on adjacent private lands. The proposal does not include any on the ground activities; therefore there should be no change to the aesthetics in either alternative.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected- the existing use is expected to continue.

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected- the existing use is expected to continue.

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected- This parcel is a remote Trust Land grazing parcel and the existing use is expected to continue.

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- 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.

If approved the tract mentioned will move from tax exempt status to taxable status, which will provide income to the county, exact amount is unknown until the assessor appraisal is completed

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

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- 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.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

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.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

Alternative A- No Impacts Expected

Alternative B- No Impacts Expected

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 tract currently has a grazing lease at the state minimum rate of \$11.41/AUM and generating an income of \$935.62 per year. Therefore this tract is considered average in productivity and producing average revenue per acre. The potential for development is very low to enhance the grazing resource. There is no indication the tract, if remaining in state ownership, would be used for purposes other than grazing and it is likely the future income would remain relatively stable. This tract overall looks to have low appreciation potential along with high administrative costs.

An appraisal of the property value has not been completed to date. Under DNRC rules, an appraisal would be conducted if preliminary approval to proceed is granted by the Board of Land Commissioners. The Department is conducting a more detailed evaluation at this time in order to make a determination on whether to offer this tract for sale. The revenue generated from the sale of this parcel would be combined with other revenue in the Land Banking account to purchase replacement property for the benefit of the trust. It is anticipated the replacement property would have legal access and be adjacent to other trust lands which would provide greater management opportunities and income. If replacement property was not purchased prior to expiration of the statute, the revenue would be deposited in the permanent trust for investment.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Marc Aberg	Date: 9/16/2014
	Title: Lands Program Manager	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Sell the tract of land

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The proposed sale of 320 acres of state trust lands through the DNRC's Land Banking Program would not result in nor cause significant environmental impacts. The average productivity (.28 acres / AUM), isolated nature of the parcel, lack of additional income generating capacity, and high administrative costs for this parcel fit within the criteria of parcels to sell identified in the Land Banking Program. It is also anticipated that the current land use activity of livestock grazing would be unchanged with the sale of this property. Considering these factors, an environmental assessment checklist is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action.

The sale of this parcel meets the overall goals and objectives of the Land Banking Program and would satisfy the trust fiduciary mandate.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Chris Pileski
	Title: Area Manager
Signature: \s\ Chris Pileski	Date: 9/18/2014

Attachment 1

The state parcel nominated for sale (W1/2 Section 14 T15N R41E) was inventoried to Class III standards for cultural and paleontological resources. No *Antiquities*, as defined under the Montana State Historic Preservation Act, were identified. Hell Creek geological formations occur on or beneath the ground surface of the subject state tract, but no evidence of fossil bearing deposits were identified.

Anne Hedges
Montana Environmental Information
Center
PO Box 1184
Helena, MT 59624

Daniel Berube
27 Cedar Lake Dr.
Butte, MT 59701

Jack Atcheson, Sr.
3210 Ottawa
Butte, MT 59701

Leslie Taylor
MSU Bozeman
P.O. Box 172440
Bozeman, MT 59717-0001

Rosi Keller
University Of Montana
32 Campus Dr.
Missoula, MT 59812-0001

Dept. of Environmental Quality
Attn: Bonnie Lovelace
PO Box 200901
Helena, MT 59620-0901

Brad Schmitz, Regional Supervisor
Dept. of Fish, Wildlife & Parks
PO Box 1630
Miles City, MT 59301

Garfield County Commissioners
PO Box 7
Jordan, MT 59337-0007

Bill Orsello/Stan Frasier
Montana Wildlife Federation
PO Box 1175
Helena, MT 59624

Julia Altemus
Montana Wood Products
PO Box 1967
Missoula, MT 59806

Janet Ellis
Montana Audubon
P.O. Box 595
Helena, MT 59624

Jake Cummins
MT Farm Bureau Federation
502 S 19th, Suite 104
Bozeman, MT 59715

Common Schools
Denise Juneau, Superintendent
Office Of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Dept of Transportation
Attn: Shane Mintz
PO Box 890
Glendive, MT 59330

McCone County Commissioners
201 West Main Street
Circle, MT 59215

Powder River County Commissioners
PO Box 846
Broadus, MT 59317

Bob Vogel
Montana School Boards Association
863 Great Northern Blvd.
Helena, MT 59601

Harold Blattie
Montana Association Of Counties
2715 Skyway Dr.
Helena, MT 59601

John Grimm
DNRC
PO Box 201601
Helena, MT 59620-1601

Kyle Hardin
Matador Cattle Co.
9500 Blacktail Rd.
Dillon, MT 59725

Dept Of Fish, Wildlife & Parks
Attn: Hugh Zackheim
PO Box 200701
Helena, MT 59620-0701

Glenn Marx, Executive Director
Montana Assoc. of Land Trust
PO Box 675
Whitehall, MT 59759

Carter County Commissioners
PO Box 315
Ekalaka, MT 59324

Montana Dept. of Transportation
Attn: Carol Haas
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

From: Wilmoth, Stan
To: Rennie, Patrick; Murdo, Damon
Subject: most up to date THPO emails/phones for our web or other
Date: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 11:27:34 AM

TRIBAL CONTACTS

TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICERS

**THE BLACKFEET NATION
TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
QUARTER 108, E. GOV. SQUARE
BOX 2809
BROWNING, MT 59417**

John Murray, THPO 406.338.7522 phone

Cell 370 8469 jmflysdown@gmail.com deputy Jeri Lawrence

Jeri Lawrence notearsjl@hotmail.com

**CHIPPEWA CREE TRIBE OF THE ROCKY BOY'S RESERVATION
TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
RR 1 #544
BOX ELDER, MT 59521**

**Alvin Windy Boy, THPO Alvin@nei-yahu.com 406.352-3077phone
c: 945-5880**

**CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF THE FLATHEAD
RESERVATION
TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
TRIBAL PRESERVATION DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 278**

PABLO, MT 59855

406.675.2700 x 1075 phone 406.675.2629 fax

francisa@cslt.org

iram@cslt.org

personal ira.matt@gmail.com

THE CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS
TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
PO BOX 159
CROW AGENCY, MONTANA 59022

Emerson Bull Child

Emerson.BullChief@crow-nsn.gov

Ph 638.4238

Cell 406 208 6670

Conrad Fisher

NORTHERN CHEYENNE TRIBE TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
PO BOX 128
LAME DEER, MT 59043

477-4839

[Conrad.Fisher@cheyennation.com]

THPO
FORT BELKNAP TRIBAL OFFICE
RR 1 BOX 66
HARLEM MT 59526

03/14
Michael Black Wolf
353-8471
mblackwolf@fbelkap.org

CURLEY YOUPEE
FORT PECK TRIBES
POB 1027
POPLAR MT 59255
cultres@nemontel.net
Direct – 768-2382

Al Wiseman
Little Shell Culture Comm
Pob 155
Choteau mt 59422

466- 2718

Aberg, Marc

From: Riley, Jean
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 10:59 AM
To: Aberg, Marc
Cc: Mintz, Shane; Bithell, Keith; Frank, James
Subject: Sale of School Trust Lands - MDT comments
Expires: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 12:00 AM

The Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) staff received a letter dated July 15, 2014. The letter indicated the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) is considering the sale of School Trust Land in Carter, Custer, Garfield, McCone and Powder River Counties.

After reviewing the information, it appears the properties are not adjacent to MDT facilities. However, if access is requested to a MDT roadway, the property owner will be required to complete the approach permit process.

If you have any questions concerning this email, please contact me.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jean A. Riley, P.E. - Transportation Planning Engineer
Policy, Program & Performance Analysis Bureau
Montana Department of Transportation
(406) 444-9456

Aberg, Marc

From: Muscha, Travis
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 9:13 PM
To: Aberg, Marc
Cc: Schmitz, Brad; Ensign, John
Subject: RE: land banking

Marc,

In response to the recent scoping letter you sent out July 2014 regarding the parcels of DNRC land that are proposed for sale under the land banking program - Region 7 MT Fish Wildlife & Parks staff (Brad Schmitz, John Ensign, Travis Muscha) have reviewed the parcels and have no objection to the potential sale of these properties. None of these State Land parcels have legal public access and are not enrolled in FWP's Block Management Program. "

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment,

Travis Muscha
Region 7 Hunting Access Enhancement Coordinator

From: Aberg, Marc
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 9:16 AM
To: Muscha, Travis
Subject: land banking

I could use a written reply to our scoping letter to follow up on your verbal okay a couple weeks ago. Thanks!!!!!!!!!!!!