

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	2007 Land Banking – Conrad Unit – CLO – Sec. 7, T33N, R4E & Sec 36, T34N, R3E
Proposed Implementation Date:	2008
Proponent:	These tracts were nominated by the lessee, DAM Inc. (Duane Markuson), and brought forward now by DNRC.
Location:	T33N, R4E, section 7, Lots 3,4, E½SW¼, SE¼, 317.81 acres T34N, R3E, section 36, All, 640 acres Total Acres: 957.81
County:	Liberty, Toole County
Trust:	Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Offer for Sale at Public Auction 957.81 acres of state land currently held in trust for the benefit of Common Schools. 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. Three maps are attached to this EA checklist: 1. Labeled “Liberty 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 “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). 3. 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, Liberty County times on 11/4/2007 and 11/11/2007 and in the Shelby Promoter 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 957.81 acres of Common School Trust Land contained in Sec. 7, T33N, R4E and Sec 36, T34N, 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, and 6E soils. The majority of the acres are class 3E and 4E soils, which are generally suitable for small grain crop production. Most acres would meet current 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 flat to gently rolling native rangeland. Soils are stable due to the permanent vegetation cover. 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.

Kinyon Coulee, an ephemeral drainage, runs though section 36. A five (5) acre reservoir is located along Kinyon Coulee in section 36. Water rights associated with the proposed tracts for sale are listed below. If sold, the water rights would be transferred to the purchaser. Other water quality and/or quality issue will not be impacted by the proposed action.

legal	Water right no.	purpose	Source	Priority date
Sec 7	41N-25085	Stock water	Unnamed Tributary of Kinyon Coulee	4/15/1939
Sec 7	41N-25086	Stock water	Unnamed Tributary	4/15/1910

			of Kinyon Coulee	
Sec 36	41N-211730	Stock water	Willow Creek	12/31/1900

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.

All acres proposed for sale are native rangeland typical of the Northern Mixed Grassed Prairie. Range sites are dominated by silty and clayey sites, and to a lesser extent thin hilly and thin silty sites. Species composition is dominated by grasses which include western wheatgrass, needle and thread grass, blue grama, thread leaf sedge, sandberg bluegrass and prairie junegrass. Sub-dominate species include various forbs and shrubs. Noxious weeds have not been identified according to previous inspections. Current range condition varies from fair to good with an estimated carrying capacity or stocking rate assessed at .216 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 effects 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.

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. 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 more than 4.6 million acres of Common School surface ownership in Montana (TLMS power search, 11/29/2007). There are approximately 86,578 and 100,028 acres of Trust land in Liberty and Toole Counties, respectively. This proposal includes 317.81 and 640 acres in Liberty and Toole Counties, respectively, a small percentage of the state land within these Counties.

There are additional tracts of state land currently under consideration for sale through the Land Banking Program. An additional 324 and 1480 acres of state land in Liberty and Toole Counties, respectively, and approximately 20,000 acres statewide is being evaluated under separate analysis. Cumulatively, these lands considered for sale represent 0.75% and 2.1% of the State Trust surface ownership in Liberty and Toole Counties, respectively, and 0.38% 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 4 tracts containing 641.81 acres in Liberty County and 17 tracts containing 2,120 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 DAM Inc. for grazing. Sale of the land to DAM Inc. 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 7	317.81	3243	98 AUMs
Sec 36	640	3649	109 AUMs

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, Liberty County would receive \$145.90 and Toole County would receive \$288.00 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 and there are no public roads or easements across private land to the state 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 7	317.81	\$686.98	\$2.16
Sec 36	640	\$764.09	\$1.19
			\$1.51 on average

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 grazing acres for an average income of \$1.62 per acre (2006 DNRC annual Report). On average, these tracts nominated for sale are below the average statewide stocking rate (.216 AUMs / ac) and income for grazing land (\$1.51 / acre). In addition, these tracts are essential for the DAM Inc ranching business

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: January 15, 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.


This tract is entirely surrounded by private lands which control access to the state land and which will likely remain unchanged if the parcel is sold. It is likely the tract will continue to be managed in a manner consistent with the surrounding private land.


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: 2/5/2008

Liberty County Land Banking Priorities





Legend	
•	City
—	Interstate
—	Highways
—	County Boundary
	TR
	DNRC Parcels
	Nominated Parcels

Toole County Land Banking Priorities





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
Alme, Henry

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. Nicholas 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
P.O. Box 486

Conrad, MT 59425
Las Vegas, NV 89130-3652
Choteau, MT 59422-9295
Power, MT 59468
1975 Century Park East - 22
Floor
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
Shelby, MT 59474

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

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

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.
Center
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
DNRC
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