CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Eric Thomas HRA 27-B-48735 Alternative Practice
Proposed Implementation Date: July, 2022
Proponent: Eric Thomas
Location: NESE of section 15, T30N R31W (48°21'44.20"N 115°32'21.52"W)
County: Lincoln

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

To allow the operation of wheeled or tracked equipment in a streamside management zone. The proposed action would utilize approximately 75 feet of an existing excavated skid trail that is located within the buffer of a class 3 stream. The use of the preexisting trail would allow for logging equipment to access about 5 acres of land without the need to construct any new excavated trails higher on the hillside or incur the expense of bringing in a line machine.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

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

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. List number of individuals contacted, number of responses received, and newspapers in which notices were placed and for how long. Briefly summarize issues received from the public.

No adjacent landowners are expected to be affected by the proposal so public scoping was not deemed necessary.

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

Examples: cost-share agreement with U.S. Forest Service, 124 Permit, 3A Authorization, Air Quality Major Open Burning Permit.

None

3. ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT:

Describe alternatives considered and, if applicable, provide brief description of how the alternatives were developed. List alternatives that were considered but eliminated from further analysis and why.

No action alternative: Do not harvest this corner of the property.

Action alternatives considered: 1) construct 200+ feet of excavated trail higher on the hillside and outside of the SMZ, 2) obtain alternative practice that would allow the utilization of existing excavated skid trail. Mitigate by creating slash filter windrow at tow of trail's fill while in SMZ and ensure all other BMPs are applied.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to soils.

Kootenai Land Type 102; this soil type is lacustrine terraces capable of high timber productivity. This soil type is moderately susceptible to soil erosion yet has a low sediment delivery efficiency.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to water resources.

An existing excavated skid trail that is within the SMZ of a class 3 stream would be reused. This trail does not cross the stream but encroaches within 20 feet of the ordinary high water mark of the class 3 stream.

Any sediment created during the use of the skid trail would have a newly constructed slash filter windrow and twenty feet of SMZ to offer filtration of surface water before entering the unnamed class 3 stream. All action alternatives are unlikely to have turbidity impacts to the stream. Mitigation measures would protect water quality and the integrity of the SMZ. The applicant prefers to reuse the existing skid trail and apply Forestry BMPs to minimize impacts to the stream which improves management options.

6. AIR QUALITY:
What pollutants or particulate would be produced (i.e. particulate matter from road use or harvesting, slash pile burning, prescribed burning, etc)? Identify the Airshed and Impact Zone (if any) according to the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to air quality.

Normal air pollution that is associated with a standard logging operation.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to vegetation.

No rare, sensitive plants or cover types were observed during ground reconnaissance. Minimal vegetation disturbance would occur from logging

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:
Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

The site of the proposed alternative practice shows no significant use by wildlife, birds or fish.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

Threatened or endangered species such as lynx and grizzly bears may migrate through the area. There were no denning sites noted on the property. Reusing the existing trail within the SMZ should not diminish habitat elements for these species.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
Identify and determine direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

No historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources were observed during field reconnaissance nor are any known by the applicant.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Normal temporary noise increase associated with logging operations. Visual appearance of site and surrounding property would appear uniform across ownerships. This location is not visible from outside of this ownership.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to environmental resources.

No limited resources will be used for this project. There are no other activities nearby that will affect the project.

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.

No other environmental documents are known for this tract.

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.

Normal Health risks associated with a logging operation.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:
Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

The project will add a minor amount of additional timber to the local wood products industry.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:
Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the employment market.

This project would add 2-5 days of additional work and income to the local work force.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:
Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

Minor additional income tax revenue would be generated from the additional work.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

There would not be any affects to the local government services.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:
List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

There is no known zoning or management planning for this area.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

This activity would have no impact to access to or quality of recreational and wilderness activities for the public.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:
Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to population and housing.

This activity would have no impact to density or distribution of population and housing.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Logging is an activity that would be considered a traditional lifestyle for this community and area; this activity would not disrupt social structures.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Cultural uniqueness and diversity would not be affected.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

There are no unique social or economic qualities on this site.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	**Name:** Jeremy Rank	**Date:** 6/28/2022	
	Title: Service Forester		

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative 2 is selected. Reuse existing excavated skid trail to conduct harvest activities. Mitigate by constructing slash filter windrow at tow of fill of trail while within the SMZ. Apply BMPs during operations.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

All action alternatives have the potential to have impacts to the land or water resources. Alternative 2 proposes to both minimize these impacts while still allowing management activities to proceed. The application of forestry BMPs and mitigations will minimize impact to water quality.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

[ ]	EIS	[ ]	More Detailed EA	[X]	No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	**Name:** Douglas Turman	
	Title: Libby Unit Manager	
Signature: Douglas Turman		**Date:** 6/30/22

Eric Thomas HRA 27-B-48735
T30N R31W sec. 15 NESE



Area of Alternative Practice Request



→ : Existing skid trail and direction of skid

= pre approved Exception

= requires alternative practice

XXX = denied request, will not authorize reuse of trail