

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	2007 Land Banking – Conrad Unit – CLO – Sec. 8, 5 T36N, R3E Sec 30, 32, 34 T37N, R3E
Proposed Implementation Date:	2008
Proponent:	These tracts were nominated by the lessee, Robert Parsell, and brought forward now by DNRC.
Location:	T36N, R3E, section 5, NE¼SE¼, 40 acres T36N, R3E, section 8, NE¼SE¼, 40 acres T37N, R3E, section 30, SE¼NW¼, 40 acres T37N, R3E, section 32, SE¼SE¼, 40 acres T37N, R3E, section 34, NE¼SW¼, NW¼NW¼, 80 acres Total Acres: 240
County:	Toole County
Trust:	Public Buildings

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Offer for Sale at Public Auction 240 acres of state land currently held in trust for the benefit of Public Buildings. Revenue from the sale would be deposited in a special account, with monies from other sales around the State, 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 the same beneficiary Trusts in relative proportion. The proposed sale is part of a program called Land Banking authorized by the 2003 Legislature, and updated by the 2007 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. Two maps are attached to this EA checklist: 1. Labeled "Toole County – Land Banking Priorities" is a general map of all state land within the county (blue) and those parcels of land considered for sale under land banking (red). 2. Labeled "Appendix B" is a satellite imagery map that indicates the tracts considered for sale in the EA checklist.

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 be submitted by lessees between October 1, 2004 and January 31, 2005. *(These tracts were nominated at that time and are now being considered as part of the second Statewide round of Land banking sales.)*
- Legal notices were published in the in the Great Falls Tribune on 11/4/2007 and 11/11/2007, and in the Shelby Promoter on 11/1/2007 and 11/8/2007.
- Direct mailings were made to lessees, adjacent land owners, County Commissioners, State Legislators (from the involved Districts and who were associated with the legislation), and a host of organizations and individuals who had expressed previous interest in this process. A full listing of contacts is attached as Appendix C.
- Follow-up contacts were made by phone, mail, or email with parties requesting additional information. These are also included in Appendix C.
- 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:

No other governmental agencies have jurisdiction over this proposal.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A (No Action) – Under this alternative, the State retains the existing land ownership pattern and would not sell the 240 acres of Public Buildings Trust Land contained in Section 5 & 8 – 36N – R3E, and Sections 30, 32, & 34—T37N-R3E.

Alternative B (the Proposed action) – Under this alternative, the Department would request and recommend approval by the Land Board to sell the proposed land locked tracts. If approved by the Board, the sale would be at public auction, subject to the requirements found in Title 77, Chapter 2, Part 3 of the Montana Codes Annotated. 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. *(The State would then review available lands for sale which would generally have access and an increased potential for income. A separate public scoping and review would be conducted when a potentially suitable parcel was found. It is not possible for this analysis to make any direct parcel to parcel comparisons.)*

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.

A variety of soil types are found across these tracts. USDA – NRCS soil survey indicated Land Capability Classification as a mixture of 3E, 4E, 4W and 6E soils. The majority of the acres are well developed and very productive class 3E soils, which would meet DNRC breaking criteria. *("If properly managed, soils in classes 1, 2, 3, 4 are suitable for the mechanized production of commonly grown field crops and for pasture and woodland. The degree of the soil limitations affecting the production of cultivated crops increases progressively from class 1 to class 5. The limitations can affect levels of production and the risk of permanent soil deterioration caused by erosion and other factors. Soils in classes 5, 6, 7 are generally not suitable for mechanized productions without special management. Capability subclasses indicate the dominant limitations in the class, E, shows that the main hazard is the risk of erosion unless a close growing plant cover is maintained." From USDA-NRCS Soil Survey).* Topography is gently rolling to hilly, with some steep slopes present. These tracts are surrounded by native rangeland contained in large pastures historically use for livestock grazing. It is unlikely these tracts would be broke for agricultural production in the future. The proposal does not involve any on the ground disturbance, so there are no soil effect differences between the alternatives. It is expected that this land will be used for livestock grazing in the future. The State owns, and would retain ownership of, all mineral rights associated with these tracts.

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.

There are no recorded water rights associated with the proposed tracts for sale. Other water quality and/or quality issue will not be impacted by the proposed action.

legal	Water right no.	purpose	Source	Priority date
	NONE			

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.

The proposal does not include any on-the-ground activities, or changes to activities. No effects to air quality would occur.

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.

These tracts are native rangeland situated on the northwest flank of Middle Butte of the Sweet Grass Hills. Rangeland in this area is located in a transitional zone between the Northern Mixed Grassed Prairie and Mountain and Foothills. Range sites very productive and vary from thin silty and silty to overflow. Species composition is dominated by grasses which include rough fescue, Idaho fescue, blue bunch wheatgrass, western wheatgrass, green needle grass, needle and thread grass, thread leaf sedge, sandberg bluegrass and prairie junegrass. Sub-dominate species include various forbs and shrubs. Current range condition varies from good to excellent with an estimated carrying capacity or stocking rate assessed at .33 AUMs per acre.

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

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 area is not considered critical wildlife habitat. However, these tracts provide habitat for a variety of big game species (mule deer, whitetail deer, pronghorn antelope), predators (coyote, fox, badger), upland game birds (sharp tail grouse, Hungarian partridge), other non-game mammals, raptors and various songbirds. The proposal does not include any land use change which would yield changes to the wildlife habitat. The proposed action will not impact wildlife forage, cover, or traveling corridors. Nor will this action change the juxtaposition of wildlife forage, water, or hiding and thermal cover.

The nominating lessee has indicated that if they purchased these tracts, the land use would remain as grazing land. There are no unique or critical wildlife habitats associated with the state tracts and we do not expect direct or cumulative wildlife impacts would occur as a result of implementing the proposal. The proposed action will not have long-term negative affects on existing wildlife species and/or wildlife habitat because of its relatively small scale.

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 specific on-site observations of Threatened or Endangered species have been recorded and no important habitat has been identified on the state lands. A review of Natural Heritage data through NRIS was conducted and Sprague's pipit, Mccown's longspur, chestnut-collar longspur, long billed curlew, and Brewer's sparrow were identified as sensitive species in the area.

The proposal does not include any activities which would alter any habitat, so no effects are expected in either alternative.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

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

Past DNRC field evaluation forms indicated the presence of scattered stone circles and cairns. A class III level inventory and subsequent evaluation of cultural and paleontologic resources will be carried out if preliminary approval of the parcel nomination by the Board of Commissioners is received. Based on the results of the Class III inventory/evaluation the DNRC will, in consultation with the Montana State Historic Preservation Officer, assess direct and cumulative impacts.

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.

These tracts are located in a rural agricultural area and not highly visible from a county road. 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, so there would be no change to the aesthetics in either alternative.

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.

There are 5,165,870 acres of Trust land and 186,991 acres of Public Buildings surface ownership in Montana (TLMS power search, 11/29/2007). There are approximately 100,018 acres of Trust land in Toole County. This proposal includes 240 acres, a small percentage of the state land within the County.

There are additional tracts of state land currently under consideration for sale through the Land Banking Program. An additional 3,375 acres of state land in Toole County and approximately 20,000 acres statewide is being evaluated under separate analysis. Cumulatively, these lands considered for sale represent 3.6% of the State Trust surface ownership in Toole County and 0.07% of the statewide Trust surface ownership.

The potential transfer of ownership will not have any impact or demands on environmental resources of Land water, air or energy.

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 on this EA.

There are 27 tracts containing 3,615 acres in Toole County proposed for sale under the Land Banking Program and being evaluated under separate review.

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.

No impacts to human health and safety would occur as a result of the proposal.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

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

The tracts included in this proposal are all leased by Robert Parsell for grazing. Sale of the land to Mr. Parsell would add to their ranching operations. Below is a table that indicates the State rated carrying capacity of the tracts being considered for sale.

Legal	acres	Lease #	State rated carrying capacity
Sec 8	40	7004	14 AUM
Sec 5	40	7004	15 AUM
Sec 30	40	7004	12 AUM
Sec 32	40	7004	14 AUM
Sec 34	80	7004	24 AUM

This proposal does not include any specific changes to the agricultural activities. The nominating lessee indicated that grazing would continue unchanged if they purchased these lands.

No direct or cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposal.

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.

The proposal would have no affect on quantity and distribution of employment.

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.

State School Trust Lands are currently exempt from property tax. If State Trust Lands represent 6% or greater of the total acres within a county, a payment in lieu of taxes (PLT) is made to the counties to mitigate for the State Trust Land tax exempt status. Counties will not realize an adjustment in the PLT payment as a result of an increase or decrease in State Trust Land acreage. If all the parcels in this proposal are sold, and use continued as grazing land, Toole County would receive \$120.00 annually in additional property tax revenues.

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

Being remote grazing lands, no traffic changes would be anticipated. All state and private land are under the County Coop wildfire protection program. The proposed sale will not change fire protections in the area.

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.

These tracts are surrounded by private land. There are no zoning or other agency management plans affecting these lands.

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.

Montana FWP commented that "FWP would recommend not disposing of lands that are generally available (accessible) to the recreating public". These tracts are not legally accessible to the general public because they are surrounded by private land. If the tracts are sold, hunting access would be controlled by the new landowner as is the current situation.

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 proposal does not include any changes to housing or developments. The nominating lessee has indicated that the lands would continue as grazing lands, if they purchase them at auction. No effects are anticipated.

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 impacted by the proposal.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

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

The State Trust lands in this proposal are currently managed for grazing. The State lands are generally indistinguishable from the adjacent private lands, with no unique quality.

The potential sale of the state land would not directly or cumulatively impact cultural uniqueness or diversity. It is unknown what management activities would take place on the land if ownership was transferred. The tracts were nominated by the lessee with the intent of purchasing and continuing use as grazing land.

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.

legal	acres	2007 Lease Income	Income per acre
Sec 8	40	\$98.14	\$2.45
Sec 5	40	\$105.15	\$2.63
Sec 30	40	\$84.12	\$2.10
Sec 32	40	\$98.14	\$4.44
Sec 34	80	\$168.24	\$2.10
TOTAL	240	\$553.79	\$2.31

The statewide stocking rate for grazing land on 4.3 million acres averages .26 AUMs per acre or a total of 1.11 million AUMs (2006 DNRC Annual Report). 2006 statewide grazing land gross revenue was \$6.98 million (\$6.99 per AUM) on 4.3 million grazing acres for an average income of \$1.62 per acre (2006 DNRC annual Report). These tracts nominated for sale are above the average statewide stocking rate (.33 AUMs/ acre) and income (\$2.31 / acre) for grazing land. Tracts are isolated and not legally accessible, which make it difficult for the State to manage.

Private land, owned by Robert Parsell, surrounding state land in sections 5 and 32 are under conservation easement. This conservation easement on private land is held by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and prohibits, subdivision, drainage of wetlands and farming of native grasslands.

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 more detailed evaluations at this time in order to make a determination on whether to offer the tracts for sale. The revenue generated from the sale of these parcels 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 the expiration of the statute, the revenue would be deposited into the permanent trust for investment.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: ERIK ENEBOE	Date: March 3, 2008
	Title: Conrad Unit Manager, Central Land Office	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

I have selected the Proposed Alternative B, recommend the tract receive preliminary approval for sale and continue with the Land Banking process.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I have evaluated the comments received and potential environment affects and have determined significant environmental effects would not result from the proposed land sale. The tract does not have any unique characteristics, critical habitat or environmental conditions indicating the tract should necessarily remain under management by the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. There are no indications the tract would produce substantially greater revenue or have substantially greater value to the trust in the near future.

These parcels are entirely surrounded by private lands which control access to the state land and if sold are likely to be managed in a manner consistent with surrounding lands. The parcels are very difficult and expensive for the DNRC to manage due to the ownership pattern which makes them difficult to distinguish and locate on the ground. Administrative Rules for Land Banking prohibit the sale of state lands if wholly surrounded by lands under a conservation easement unless there is a compelling reason. In this situation, two of the parcels (80 acres) are surrounded by lands under a conservation easement while the other 4 parcels (200 acres) are not. All parcels meet the intent of the land banking program and are very good candidates for sale. Given the difficulty in managing these parcels and the likely sale of the non-surrounded 200 acres, there is no reason to retain the 2 wholly surrounded 40 acres parcels. Retaining those parcels would only increase management expense and inefficiency.


27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:


☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: GARRY WILLIAMS
	Title: Area Manager, Central Land Office

Signature: /S/ Garry Williams

Date: 3/11/2008





Appendix C

Adjacent Land Owners / Lessee's

Denzer, Allen & Darlene
VanHorn, Ruth Dorothy
Truchot, Isabelle
Burgmaier, John
Deep Creek Ranch & Mgmt. Co.
Livestock, Pine Tree
Lightner Farms, Inc.
Christiaens Bros. Farm, Inc.
Pondera Colony, Inc.
Angus, Diamond D
Scheel, Walter
Sheble Ranch, Inc.
Tribe, Blackfeet
Agency, BIA - Blackfeet
Lear, Jerry
Bisnett, Phillip
Reishus, Don
Hovland, Elena & Marie
BLM - Havre Field Office
Pugsley Ranches, Inc.
Wicks, Maureen
Buffington, Doug
Buffington, Don
Buffington, Norman
Hurley, Gordon
Markuson, Barb
Harwood, R.A.
Farms, Frederickson
DAM, Inc.
Clark, Charles & Sally
Clark, Walter
Ranch, West Butte
MCR, LLC
Ratzburg Livestock, LLP
Fey, Albert
Partnership, Anderson/Schulz Fey Family
G&S Land & Cattle Co.
Livestock, Marias River Land &
Torgerson, Eric
DAM, Inc.
Fenger, Tim
Farms, Steve Leck
Hatch, Logan
Smith, Lawrence
Alme, Steve
Danielson, Mary

P.O. Box 937
5456 Patchwood Ct.
11 2nd Ave. SW
851 19th Lane NE
c/o James Jackoway
710 20th Road NW
99 E. Nichlaus Avenue
2576 Christiaens Road
300 Pondera Colony Road
1133 Valier Dupuyer Road
300 Pondera Colony Road
6799 Valier Cut Bank Hwy.
P.O. Box 850
P.O. Box 880
P.O. Box 621
P.O. Box 150
P.O. Box 136
P.O. Box 150
Drawer 911
P.O. Box 460
5238 Broadhurst Road
HC74 Box 59
HC 74, Box 59
DMB 321
Box 63
915 N. Marias Avenue
101 Harwood Rd.
P.O. Box 634
Box 24
Box 32
Box 32
Box 32
Box 716
HC Box 21A
HC 51, Box 270
223 Commons Way
P.O. Box 866
1137 Adel Road
P.O. Box

HC 51, Box 19
P.O. Box 95
718 Ricky Lane
1113 1st Street S.
P.O. Box 486
242 Danielson Road

Conrad, MT 59425
Las Vegas, NV 89130-3652
Choteau, MT 59422-9295
Power, MT 59468
1975 Century Park East-22 fl.
Choteau, MT 59422
Kalispell, MT 59901
Valier, MT 59486
Valier, MT 59486
Valier, MT 59486
Valier, MT 59486
Valier, MT 59486
Browning, MT 59417
Browning, MT 59417
Choteau, MT 59422
Dupuyer, MT 59432
Dupuyer, MT 59432
Dupuyer, MT 59432
Havre, MT 59501
Chester, MT 59522
Ledger, MT 59456
Ledger, MT 59456
Ledger, MT 59456
Sparks, NV 89441
Ledger, MT 59456
Shelby, MT 59474
Shelby, MT 59474
Chester, MT 59422
Galata, MT 59444
Sweetgrass, MT 59484
Sweetgrass, MT 59484
Sweetgrass, MT 59484
Shelby, MT 59474
Ledger, MT 59456
Galata, MT 59444
Kalispell, MT 59901-1902
Cut Bank, MT 59427
Cascade, MT 59421
Ethridge, MT 59435

Galata, MT 59444
Galata, MT 59444
Walla Walla, WA 99362
Shelby, MT 59474
Shelby, MT 59474
Kevin, MT 59454

Alme, Henry
 Farms, Klondike Ridge
 McDermott, Henry
 Midboe, Jim
 O'Brien, Gail
 Kluth, Inc.
 Ranch, Willow Ridge
 Kincaid, Delbert
 Smith, Gerald
 Dyrdaahl, Jennie
 Deltana, Inc.
 Parsell, Robert
 Parsell, David

P.O. Box 486
 P.O. Box 326
 812 N. Teton Ave.
 Box 568
 139 Ireland CT
 P.O. Box 670
 1753 N. Devon Road
 8101 Brandywine Pkwy
 P.O. Box 31
 203 E. Granite Avenue
 29856 Hwy. 2
 Box 82
 1995 Miners Coulee Road

Shelby, MT 59474
 Sunburst, MT 59482
 Shelby, MT 59474
 Shelby, MT 59474
 Rockwell, TX 75087
 Shelby, MT 59474
 Galata, MT 59444
 Brooklyn Park, MN 55444
 Galata, MT 59444
 Shelby, MT 59474
 Devon, MT 59474
 Whitlash, MT 59545
 Whitlash, MT 59545

Rule Making Committee / Other Interested Parties

Hedges, Ann
 Orsell, Bill
 Frasier, Stan
 Vogel, Bob
 Berube, Daniel
 Engstedt, Ellen
 Blattie, Harold
 The Nature Conservancy
 Atcheson, Sr., Jack
 Ellis, Janet
 Holmgren, Jeanne
 Taylor, Leslie
 Schlepp, Nancy
 Marxer, Ray
 Keller, Rosi
 Commissioner, Toole County
 Commissioners, Teton County
 Commissioners, Liberty County
 Commissioners, Pondera County
 Representative, Joey Jayne -
 Representative, Llew Jones -
 Senate, Jerry Black -
 Representative, Rick Ripley -
 Senate, John Cobb -
 Tribes, Confederated Salish & Kootenai
 Tribe, Blackfeet
 Senate, Carol Juneau -
 FWP, MT -
 FWP, MT -
 FWP, MT -
 Nick Morrison
 Fred Banka
 Patrick Fisher
 Chub Michels
 Dan Roark

Montana Environmental Info. Cntr
 Montana Wildlife Federation
 Montana Wildlife Federation
 Montana School Boards Assn.
 27 Cedar Lake Drive
 Montana Wood Products
 Montana Association of Counties
 32 S. Ewing
 3210 Ottawa
 Montana Audobon Society
 DNR
 MSU Bozeman
 Montana Farm Bureau Federation
 Matador Cattle Company
 University of Montana
 226 1st Street South
 110 South Main Street
 111 First Street E.
 20 4th Avenue SW
 House District 15
 House District 27
 Senate District 14
 House District 17
 Senate District 9
 51383 Highway 93 North
 P.O. Box 850
 Senate District 8
 Region 4 Office
 Gary Olson
 Brent Lonner
 1816 6th Street NW
 P.O. Box 913
 125 4th Ave SW
 1402 Benjamin Road

P.O. Box 1184
 P.O. Box 1175
 P.O. Box 1174
 1 South Montana Avenue
 Butte, MT 59701
 P.O. Box 1149
 2715 Skyway Drive
 Helena, MT 59460
 Butte, MT 59701
 P.O. Box 595
 Box 201601
 P.O. Box 172440
 502 19th, Suite 4
 9500 Blacktail Road
 32 Campus Drive
 Shelby, MT 59474
 Choteau, MT 59422
 Chester, MT 59222
 Conrad, MT 59425
 299 Lumpury Road
 1102 4th Avenue SW
 445 O'Haire Boulevard
 8920 Montana Highway 200
 P.O. Box 78
 P.O. Box 78
 Browning, MT 59417
 P.O. Box 55
 4600 Giant Springs Road
 514 S. Front Street, Suite C
 P.O. Box 488
 Great Falls, MT 59404
 Conrad, MT 59425
 Cut Bank, MT 59427
 Dutton, MT
 Oilmont, MT 59466