

MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS
1420 EAST SIXTH AVE.
HELENA, MONTANA 59620
(406) 444-2452

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Fur Farm, Game Bird Farm, Zoo/Menagerie, Shooting Preserve

PART 1. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

Project Title: Gerald and Deborah Roe Bobcat and Lynx Fur Farm

Application Date: Feb 22, 2013

Name, Address and Phone Number: Gerald and Deborah Roe 472 Wild Iris Road, Stevensville, MT 59870 406-369-0065

Description of Project:

This project is an application for a commercial fur farm for the purpose of raising and selling Bobcats, Bobcat kittens, Lynx and Lynx kittens to the general public. The facility is located approximately 10 miles north of Stevensville, Montana at 472 Wild Iris Road, Stevensville MT 59870.

The overall outside dimension and construction for the animal facility is 14' x 60' x 10' woven kennel fencing with one exterior gate. The animals will be housed in separate pens inside the facility. The inside enclosure is divided into six equal rectangular pens of 10' x 6' x 10'. The individual pens have one gate that connects to an enclosed walk-way in front of each pen. The walk-way is 4' x 60' x 10'.

The pens are located adjacent to the applicant's residence.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: Ravalli county commissioners, United States Department of Agriculture, Montana Department of Health and Human Services.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Table 1. Potential impact on physical environment.

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below Or On Attached Pages
1. Unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources.				X		
2. Terrestrial or aquatic life and/or habitats.				X		
3. Introduction of new species into an area.				X		
4. Vegetation covers quantity and quality.				X		
5. Water quality, quantity and distribution (surface or groundwater)				X		
6. Existing water right or reservation.				X		
7. Geology and soil quality, stability and moisture.				X		
8. Air quality or objectionable odors.			X			
9. Historical and archaeological sites.				X		
10. Demands on environmental resources of land, water, air and energy.				X		
11. Aesthetics				X		

Comments:

(A description of potentially significant or unknown impacts and potential alternatives for mitigation must be provided.)

8) There could be an increase in smell of bobcat urine and feces dependent on the waste management practice employed by Roe.

Table 2. Potential impacts on human environment:

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below Or On Attached Pages
1. Social structures and cultural diversity.				X		
2. Changes in existing public benefits provided by wildlife populations and/or habitat.				X		
3. Local and state tax base and tax revenue.				X		
4. Agricultural production.				X		
5. Human health.			X			
6. Quantity and distribution of community and person income.				X		
7. Access to and quality of recreational activities.				X		
8. Locally adopted environmental plans and goals (ordinances).				X		
9. Distribution and density of population and housing.				X		
10. Demands for government services.			X			
11. Industrial and/or commercial activity.				X		

Comments:

(A description of potentially significant or unknown impacts and potential alternatives for mitigation must be provided.)

5) The risk of injury to the public is minor due to the primary enclosure.

10) Increase in demand for service by FWP due to license review and inspection.

Does the proposed action involve potential risks or adverse effects, which are uncertain but extremely harmful, if they were to occur? There are no potential or adverse effects that would pose any significant impact on the environment.

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

There are no impacts associated with this project that taken collectively will have a significant or potentially significant impact.

Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives (including the no action alternative) to the proposed action when alternatives are reasonably available and prudent to consider. Include a discussion of how the alternatives would be implemented:

1. No action alternative. Under the no action alternative the facility would not be licensed.
2. Preferred Alternative: The facility is granted a license to raise Bobcats and Lynx commercially.

List proposed mitigation measures (stipulations) for license: The outside perimeter gate and each individual interior gate must be padlock at all times.

Individuals or groups contributing to, or commenting on this EA:

EA prepared by: DOUGLAS E. JOHNSON

Date completed: April 28, 2013

PART 3. DECISION

Recommendation and justification concerning preparation of EIS:

No EIS is needed for this project.

Describe public involvement, if any:

This EA has been posted on the FWP state website making it available for public comment from May 10, 2013, to May 20, 2013, as required by department guidelines.

Recommendation for license approval:

License approved

Comments may be e-mailed to Warden Doug Johnson at dejohnson@mt.gov or mailed to:

Wildlife Manager

Date

Warden Captain

Date