

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Issue Stream Protection Act 124 Permit to the Forest Service to Replace the Box Elder Creek Low Water Ford Crossing in Carter County

FWP-CEA-FSH-R7-25-003

5/30/2025



Table of Contents

I.	Compliance with the Montana Environmental Policy Act	3
II.	Background and Description of Proposed Project	3
III.	Purpose and Need	4
IV.	Other Agency Regulatory Responsibilities	5
V.	List of Mitigations, Stipulations	6
	Table 4: SPA 124 Permit Conditions the Department Will Require to Issue Permit.....	6
VI.	Alternatives Considered	7
VII.	Summary of Potential Impacts of the Proposed Project on the Physical Environment and Human Population ...	7
VIII.	Private Property Impact Analysis (Takings).....	15
IX.	Public Participation	15
X.	Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis	17
XI.	EA Preparation and Review	17
	Attachment 1.....	18
	SPA 124 Permit General Conditions	18

I. Compliance with the Montana Environmental Policy Act

Before a proposed project may be approved, environmental review must be conducted to identify and consider potential impacts of the proposed project on the human and physical environment affected by the project. The Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and its implementing rules and regulations require different levels of environmental review, depending on the proposed project, significance of potential impacts, and the review timeline. § 75-1-201, Montana Code Annotated (“MCA”), and the Administrative Rules of Montana (“ARM”) 12.2.430, General Requirements of the Environmental Review Process.

FWP must prepare an EA when:

- *It is considering a “state-proposed project,” which is defined in § 75-1-220(8)(a) as:
 - (i) a project, program, or activity initiated and directly undertaken by a state agency;
 - (ii) ... a project or activity supported through a contract, grant, subsidy, loan, or other form of funding assistance from a state agency, either singly or in combination with one or more other state agencies; or
 - (iii) ... a project or activity authorized by a state agency acting in a land management capacity for a lease, easement, license, or other authorization to act.*
- *It is not clear without preparation of an EA whether the proposed project is a major one significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. ARM 12.2.430(3)(a));*
- *FWP has not otherwise implemented the interdisciplinary analysis and public review purposes listed in ARM 12.2.430(2) (a) and (d) through a similar planning and decision-making process (ARM 12.2.430(3)(b));*
- *Statutory requirements do not allow sufficient time for the FWP to prepare an EIS (ARM 12.2.430(3)(c));*
- *The project is not specifically excluded from MEPA review according to § 75-1-220(8)(b) or ARM 12.2.430(5); or*
- *As an alternative to preparing an EIS, prepare an EA whenever the project is one that might normally require an EIS, but effects which might otherwise be deemed significant appear to be mitigable below the level of significance through design, or enforceable controls or stipulations or both imposed by the agency or other government agencies. For an EA to suffice in this instance, the agency must determine that all the impacts of the proposed project have been accurately identified, that they will be mitigated below the level of significance, and that no significant impact is likely to occur. The agency may not consider compensation for purposes of determining that impacts have been mitigated below the level of significance (ARM 12.2.430(4)).*

MEPA is procedural; its intent is to ensure that impacts to the environment associated with a proposed project are fully considered and the public is informed of potential impacts resulting from the project.

II. Background and Description of Proposed Project


Name of Project: Box Elder Creek Low Water Crossing Project

The purpose of the project is replacing the deteriorating low water vented ford crossing with a new vented ford style structure that meets current design standards. The culvert in the existing crossing is undersized and does not meet Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP) requirements and frequently causes the roadway to be overtopped. The proposed new structure includes two larger box culverts sized to increase the hydraulic capacity, so backwater is reduced and the occurrence of stream flows overtopping the crossing should be reduced. The new crossing conforms to current Forest Service Standards and ensures the public is able to safely access the multiple trails, access roads, facilities, and other recreational opportunities located in Custer Gallatin National Forest. The project is located approximately 15 miles east of Ekalaka, and approximately 1.5 miles north of the entrance to the Custer Gallatin National Forest in Carter County,

Montana. The project would first remove the existing undersized 10' span by 2' rise concrete box culvert, along with wingwalls and footings. The replacement low-water crossing consists of (2) 24' span by 8' rise, precast reinforced 4-sided concrete box culverts. The proposed road alignment will closely follow the existing road alignment. The width of the stream at the crossing is being widened to provide smoother, more natural flow through the crossing, and to replicate the natural stream geometry more closely within the reference reach of the project. Streambed material is being placed along the bottom of the new culverts, embedding the culvert inverts 1.5-feet below the streambed.

Affected Area / Location of Proposed Project:

- Legal Description
 - Latitude/Longitude: 45.821905° -104.241732°
 - Section, Township, and Range: T1N R60E S27
 - Town/City, County, Montana: 15 miles east of Ekalaka MT in Carter County
- Location Map – red dot and circle



III. Purpose and Need

The EA must include a description of the benefits and purpose of the proposed project. ARM 12.2.432(3)(b). Benefits of the proposed project refer to benefits to the resource, public, department, state, and/or other.

The age and condition of the existing low water crossing has approached the expected life of the structure. The proposed new structure will improve the safety for public using the structure, improve the form and function of the stream due to larger culvert openings, and improve connective for fish migrations as described below by the applicant:

- This proposed project will be constructed in accordance with Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control erosion and sedimentation. Project will require installation of temporary erosion control measures along the stream banks to isolate flow and prevent silt and construction debris from entering the streambed. Areas of

channel excavation will be seeded with a certified weed-free seed mix with desirable plant species as soon as possible post-construction.

- Long term, the new structure is designed to meet aquatic organism passage requirements providing stream bed continuity and re-establishing the natural grade of the stream.
- The new structure will improve the hydraulic efficiency of the crossing and reduce the frequency of overtopping events. The box culverts size will be increased from a single 10 feet wide by 2 feet tall to two concrete box culverts 24 feet wide by 8 feet tall. The hydraulic capacity of the new structure is designed for the 5-year storm event with some overtopping of the roadway. The completed project will provide a similar water velocity to the natural conditions during a 2-year storm event and decreases water velocity slightly during larger storm events. The width of the stream at the crossing is being widened at the downstream end of the structure to provide smoother, more natural flow through the crossing, and to replicate the natural stream geometry more closely within the reference reach of the project.
- The road surface width will be increased to improve vehicle use of the crossing and will dramatically increase the weight bearing limits of the structure.

If FWP prepared a cost/benefit analysis before completion of the EA, the EA must contain the cost/benefit analysis or a reference to it. ARM 12.2.432(3)(b).

	Yes*	No
Was a cost/benefit analysis prepared for the proposed project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* If yes, a copy of the cost/benefit analysis prepared for the proposed project is included in Attachment A to this Draft EA

IV. Other Agency Regulatory Responsibilities

FWP must list any federal, state, and/or local agencies that have overlapping or additional jurisdiction, or environmental review responsibility for the proposed project, as well as permits, licenses, and other required authorizations. ARM 12.2.432(3)(c).

*A list of other required local, state, and federal approvals, such as permits, certificates, and/or licenses from affected agencies is included in **Table 1** below. **Table 1** provides a summary of state requirements but does not necessarily represent a complete and comprehensive list of all permits, certificates, or approvals needed. Agency decision-making is governed by state and federal laws, including statutes, rules, and regulations, that form the legal basis for the conditions the proposed project must meet to obtain necessary permits, certificates, licenses, or other approvals. Further, these laws set forth the conditions under which each agency could deny the necessary approvals.*

Table 1: Federal, State, and/or Local Regulatory Responsibilities

Agency	Type of Authorization (permit, license, stipulation, other)	Purpose
Montana Department Of Environmental Quality	Short-term Water Quality Standard for Turbidity -318 Authorization	Reduce impacts of increased turbidity.
US Army Corps of Engineers	Federal Clean Water Act - 404 Permit	To restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters.

V. List of Mitigations, Stipulations

Mitigations, stipulations, and other enforceable controls required by FWP, or another agency, may be relied upon to limit potential impacts associated with a proposed Project. The table below lists and evaluates enforceable conditions FWP may rely on to limit potential impacts associated with the proposed Project. ARM 12.2.432(3)(g).

Table 2: Listing and Evaluation of Enforceable Mitigations Limiting Impacts

<i>Are enforceable controls limiting potential impacts of the proposed action? If not, no further evaluation is needed.</i>			Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If yes, are these controls being relied upon to limit impacts below the level of significance? If yes, list the enforceable control(s) below</i>			Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Enforceable Control	Responsible Agency	Authority (Rule, Permit, Stipulation, Other)	Effect of Enforceable Control on Proposed Project	
SPA 124 Permit - General Requirements (see Appendix 1)	FWP	SPA 124	SPA 124 Permit, General Conditions, provide best management practices in the form of enforceable controls to limit potential adverse impacts from the proposed project. Fines may be levied for violating these general requirements and/or corrective action may be required to remedy non-compliance.	

VI. SPA 124 Permit Action

Any applicable Montana stream work that is not otherwise excluded from MEPA review under the applicable requirements of ARM 12.2.454, Actions that Qualify for a Categorical Exclusion, and has the potential to alter the stream channel or bank, requires a project-specific 124 Stream Protection Act Permit or SPA 124 Permit prior to the start of work. The SPA 124 permit is issued by FWP's Fisheries Division and includes both the general conditions described in Attachment 1 and any additional Special Conditions deemed necessary to protect and preserve the affected waterway. Additional conditions deemed necessary to protect and preserve the affected stream from potential impacts associated with the proposed project are listed in Table 4 below.

Table 3: SPA 124 Permit Conditions the Department Will Require to Issue Permit.

Activity	Special Condition	Description
Timing of construction with normal stream flow.	Construction conducted during low flow periods (June-September) and all in-stream work shall be completed expeditiously to minimize potential impacts to the stream and fish passage.	Flow restriction

Timing restriction due to sauger spawning.	April 1- May 15 (sauger spawning period)	No in stream work authorized during the sauger spawning period.

VII. Alternatives Considered

In addition to the proposed Project, and as required by MEPA, FWP analyzes the "no-action" alternative in this EA. Under the "no-action" alternative, FWP would not do the proposed project.

Under the "No Action" alternative, the proposed project would not occur. Therefore, no additional impacts to the physical environment or human population in the analysis area would occur. The "No Action" alternative forms the baseline from which the potential impacts of the proposed Project can be measured.

The "No Action" alternative would result in not issuing the SPA124 Permit and the existing structure would continue to be the local access route across Box Elder Creek and to the north end of the Forest Service lands and roads. According to the Forest Service, the existing structure is becoming a maintenance challenge both visibly and structurally. This would have an impact to public access to the recreation values in the area and limit adjacent and local landowners from accessing private property in the area. Emergency services to the area, like fighting forest fires, would also be challenged if the existing structure becomes less useable and weight limits reduced due to structural integrity. Eventually, the road could be closed if the crossing becomes a safety concern.

	Yes*	No
Were any additional and reasonable alternatives considered?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* If yes, a list and description of the other alternatives considered, but not carried forward for detailed review is included below

In addition to the proposed project and the No Action alternative, FWP analyzed the following alternatives:

Alternative 3: Recommend Bridge Installation

Bridges are always a superior design relative to maintaining stream form/function and related wildlife benefits (for example - fish passage and amphibian and reptile usage and movements throughout the stream corridor). However, bridges are far more expensive to construct, monitor, and maintain. Thus, financial decisions must be compared to the amount of public use of the structure annually or over time. Being a rural area and not being a direct travel route to populated areas, funding and limited public use simply do not support requesting the Forest Service or County Commissioners to install a bridge. Furthermore, the increased hydraulic capacity of the proposed new structure, placement of the culverts below the stream bed, and expanding the width of the stream channel adjacent to the structure will likely improve stream function and fish passage similar to the installation of a bridge.

	Yes*	No
Were any additional alternatives considered and dismissed for cause?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* If yes, a list and description of the other alternatives considered, but not carried forward for detailed review, is included below

VIII. Summary of Potential Impacts of the Proposed Project on the Physical Environment and Human Population

The impacts analysis identifies and evaluates **direct**, **secondary**, and **cumulative impacts**.

- **Direct impacts** are those that occur at the same time and place as the action that triggers the effect.

- **Secondary impacts** “are further impacts to the human environment that may be stimulated or induced by or otherwise result from a direct impact of the action.” ARM 12.2.429(18).
- **Cumulative impacts** “means the collective impacts on the human environment of the proposed action when considered in conjunction with other past and present actions related to the proposed action by location or generic type. Related future actions must also be considered when these actions are under concurrent consideration by any state agency through pre-impact statement studies, separate impact statement evaluation, or permit processing procedures.” ARM 12.2.429(7).

Where impacts are expected to occur, the impact analysis estimates the **extent, duration, frequency, and severity** of the impact. The duration of an impact is quantified as follows:

- **Short-Term:** impacts that would not last longer than the proposed project.
- **Long-Term:** impacts that would remain or occur following the proposed project.

The severity of an impact is measured using the following:

- **No Impact:** there would be no change from current conditions.
- **Negligible:** an adverse or beneficial effect would occur but would be at the lowest levels of detection.
- **Minor:** the effect would be noticeable but would be relatively small and would not affect the function or integrity of the resource.
- **Moderate:** the effect would be easily identifiable and would change the function or integrity of the resource.
- **Major:** the effect would irretrievably alter the resource.

Some impacts may require mitigation. As defined in ARM 12.2.429, mitigation means:

- Avoiding an impact by not taking a certain action or parts of a project;
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of a project and its implementation;
- Rectifying an impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment; or
- Reducing or eliminating an impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of a project or the time period thereafter that an impact continues.

A list of any mitigation strategies including, but not limited to, design, enforceable controls or stipulations, or both, as applicable to the proposed project is included in **Section VI** above.

FWP must analyze impacts to the physical and human environment for each alternative considered. The proposed project considered the following alternatives:

- **Alternative 1: No Action. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population**

Under the “No Action” alternative, the proposed project would not occur. Therefore, no additional impacts to the physical environment or human population in the analysis area would occur. The “No Action” alternative forms the baseline from which the potential impacts of the proposed Project can be measured.

- **Alternative 2: Proposed Project. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population**

See **Table 4** (Impacts on Physical Environment) and **Table 5** (Impacts on Human Population) below.

IX. Cumulative Impacts Analysis

For the purposes of MEPA, "cumulative impact" means the collective impacts on the human environment of the proposed action when considered in conjunction with other past and present actions related to the proposed action by location or generic type. Related future actions must also be considered when such actions are under concurrent consideration by any state agency through pre-impact statement studies, separate impact statement evaluation, or permit processing procedures. ARM 12.2.429(7).

"Action" means a project, program or activity directly undertaken by the agency; a project or activity supported through a contract, grant, subsidy, loan or other form of funding assistance from the agency, either singly or in combination with one or more other state agencies; or a project or activity involving the issuance of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use or permission to act by the agency, either singly or in combination with other state agencies. ARM 12.2.429(1).

Under the “No Action” alternative, the proposed project would not occur. Therefore, no cumulative impacts to the affected human environment would occur. The “No Action” alternative forms the baseline from which the potential impacts of the proposed project are measured. For the purposes of the proposed project, the cumulative impacts analysis applies to all resources analyzed under Alternative 2, Proposed Project. See Tables 3 and 4 of this Draft EA.

The proposed project would replace the existing low water vented ford crossing with a larger low water vented ford crossing that will maintain and increase the public use of the crossing and access to the Custer National Forest. Local landowners will also benefit from the new crossing to facilitate access to other properties and improved ability to transport (haul or tow) heavier loads over the new crossing. No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project; however, cumulative impacts would occur.

The information below identifies past, present, and future actions (i.e., activities to be considered by the cumulative impacts analysis) related to the proposed action by location or generic type. Actions considered in these analyses were identified by FWP and other subject matter experts. Past and present actions are accounted for as part of the existing, or “baseline,” environmental conditions. MEPA is forward-looking, with analyses focused on the potential impacts of the proposed action with consideration for any past, present, or future related actions.

Related Past, Present, and Future State Actions:

Past, Present, and Future Related MEPA Review

The following list identifies environmental review conducted to assess potential impacts to the affected human environment from past, present, and known future related projects or actions. Past and present actions are accounted for as part of the existing, or “baseline,” environmental conditions of the affected human environment prior to approval and implementation of the proposed project, and any known future related project(s). FWP is unaware of any future related actions that would cumulatively impact the affected human environment with consideration for the proposed project and/or any of the past and present actions.

As noted, none of the project-specific environmental review documents cited above identified the potential for significant adverse impacts, including cumulative impacts, to the affected human environment. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement or EIS-level MEPA review was not required, and each project was approved through EA-level MEPA review. With consideration for potential impacts from the proposed project, FWP determined that no significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. For additional information see the resource-specific impacts analyses contained in the section of the Draft EA titled “Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population,” for the proposed action and any alternatives to the proposed action.

Table 4 - Potential Impacts of the Proposed Project on the Physical Environment

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	Duration of Impact			Severity of Impact					Summary of Potential Direct, Secondary, and Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures
	None	Short-Term	Long-Term	None	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	
Terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Projects on Box Elder Creek have the potential to impact the presence of sauger or disrupt sauger migrations. This project will be completed during low flow periods, and outside the sauger spawning migration period (March 15-May 1) which are adequate mitigation measure to prevent direct impacts to sauger.
Water quality, quantity, and distribution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Geology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Soil quality, stability, and moisture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Vegetation cover, quantity, and quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Widening the stream channel upstream and downstream of the crossing will remove some vegetation above the normal high-water line. This disturbed area will be mitigated through seeding to revegetate the disturbed areas.
Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Historical and archaeological sites	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Demands on environmental resources of land, water, air, and energy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Table 5 - Potential Impacts of the Proposed Project on the Human Population

HUMAN POPULATION	Duration of Impact			Severity of Impact					
Resource	None	Short-Term	Long-Term	None	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Summary of Potential Direct, Secondary, and Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Social structures and mores	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Cultural uniqueness and diversity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Access to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This public crossing is the primary and one of only three access routes to the Long Pines Unit of the Forest Service. Thus, during construction efforts, access through the site will be closed temporarily. Providing and maintaining this critical access route for the public, local landowners, and emergency services (firefighting) is critical for recreational opportunities and quality of living in the area. The impacts of the closure will be temporary but will secure a reliable and safe access route through the area for many years into the future.
Local and state tax base and tax revenues	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Agricultural or Industrial production	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The short-term impacts from closure of the crossing during construction activities will be offset by a new crossing that will be safer and support more weight for standard truck or trailer loads hauling livestock, forage, and grains.
Human health and safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This public crossing is the primary and one of only three access routes to the Long Pines Unit of the Forest Service. Thus, during construction efforts, access through the site will be closed temporarily. Providing and maintaining this

HUMAN POPULATION	Duration of Impact			Severity of Impact					
Resource	None	Short-Term	Long-Term	None	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Summary of Potential Direct, Secondary, and Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures
									critical access route for the public, local landowners, and emergency services (firefighting, EMS) is critical for recreational opportunities and quality of living in the area. The impacts of the closure will be temporary, but will secure a reliable and safe access route through the area for many years into the future.
Quantity and distribution of employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Distribution and density of population and housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Demands for government services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Industrial, agricultural, and commercial activity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Locally adopted environmental plans and goals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other appropriate social and economic circumstances	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Table 6: Determining the Significance of Impacts on the Quality of the Human Environment

If the EA identifies impacts associated with the proposed project FWP must determine the significance of the impacts. ARM 12.2.431. This determination forms the basis for FWP's decision as to whether it is necessary to prepare an environmental impact statement. An impact may be adverse, beneficial, or both. If none of the adverse effects of the impact are significant, an EIS is not required. An EIS is required if an impact has a significant adverse effect, even if the agency believes that the effect on balance will be beneficial. ARM 12.2.431.

According to the applicable requirements of ARM 12.2.431, FWP must consider the criteria identified in this table to determine the significance of each impact on the quality of the human environment. The significance determination is made by giving weight to these criteria in their totality. For example, impacts identified as moderate or major in severity may not be significant if the duration is short-term. However, moderate or major impacts of short-term duration may be significant if the quantity and quality of the resource is limited and/or the resource is unique or fragile. Further, moderate or major impacts to a resource may not be significant if the quantity of that resource is high or the quality of the resource is not unique or fragile.

Criteria Used to Determine Significance

1	<p>The severity, duration, geographic extent, and frequency of the occurrence of the impact</p> <p>“Severity” describes the density of the potential impact, while “extent” describes the area where the impact will likely occur, e.g., a project may propagate ten noxious weeds on a surface area of 1 square foot. Here, the impact may be high in severity, but over a low extent. In contrast, if ten noxious weeds were distributed over ten acres, there may be low severity over a larger extent.</p> <p>“Duration” describes the time period during which an impact may occur, while “frequency” describes how often the impact may occur, e.g., an operation that uses lights to mine at night may have frequent lighting impacts during one season (duration).</p>
2	The probability that the impact will occur if the proposed project occurs; or conversely, reasonable assurance in keeping with the potential severity of an impact that the impact will not occur
3	Growth-inducing or growth-inhibiting aspects of the impact, including the relationship or contribution of the impact to cumulative impacts
4	The quantity and quality of each environmental resource or value that would be affected, including the uniqueness and fragility of those resources and values
5	The importance to the state and to society of each environmental resource or value that would be affected
6	Any precedent that would be set as a result of an impact of the proposed project that would commit FWP to future actions with significant impacts or a decision in principle about such future actions
7	Potential conflict with local, state, or federal laws, requirements, or formal plans

X. Private Property Impact Analysis (Takings and Damages)

The 54th Montana Legislature enacted the Private Property Assessment Act, now found at § 2-10-101. The intent was to establish an orderly and consistent process by which state agencies evaluate their proposed projects under the "Takings Clauses" of the United States and Montana Constitutions. The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution provides: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Similarly, Article II, Section 29 of the Montana Constitution provides: "Private property shall not be taken or damaged for public use without just compensation..."

The Private Property Assessment Act applies to proposed agency projects pertaining to land or water management or to some other environmental matter that, if adopted and enforced without due process of law and just compensation, would constitute a deprivation of private property in violation of the United States or Montana Constitutions.

The Montana State Attorney General's Office has developed guidelines for use by state agencies to assess the impact of a proposed agency project on private property. The assessment process includes a careful review of all issues identified in the Attorney General's guidance document (Montana Department of Justice 1997). If the use of the guidelines and checklist indicates that a proposed agency project has taking or damaging implications, the agency must prepare an impact assessment in accordance with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act.

Table 7: Private Property Assessment (Takings)

PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESMENT ACT (PPAA)			
Does the Proposed Action Have Takings Implications under the PPAA?	Question #	Yes	No
Does the project pertain to land or water management or environmental regulations affecting private property or water rights?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action result in either a permanent or an indefinite physical occupation of private property?	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? (If answer is NO, skip questions 4a and 4b and continue with question 5)	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interest?	4a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property?	4b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership?	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action have a severe impact of the value of the property?	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public general? (If the answer is NO, skip questions 7a-7c.)	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?	7a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded?	7b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the government action diminished property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question?	7c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the proposed action result in taking or damaging implications?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Taking or damaging implications exist if YES is checked in response to Question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if NO is checked in response to question 4a or 4b.			

If taking or damaging implications exist, the agency must comply with MCA § 2-10-105 of the PPAA, to include the preparation of a taking or damaging impact assessment. Normally, the preparation of an impact assessment will require consultation with agency legal staff.

Alternatives:

The analysis under the Private Property Assessment Act, §§ 2-10-101 through -112, MCA, indicates no impact. FWP does not plan to impose conditions that would restrict the regulated person's use of private property to constitute a taking.

XI. Public Participation

The level of analysis in an EA will vary with the complexity and seriousness of environmental issues associated with a proposed action. The level of public interest will also vary. FWP is responsible for adjusting public review to match these factors (ARM 12.2.433(1)). Because FWP determines the proposed action will result in limited environmental impact, and little public interest has been expressed, FWP determines the following public notice strategy will provide an appropriate level of public review:

Under usual circumstances, FWP makes all Draft EAs available for public comment, as MEPA requires FWP to comply with its terms "to the fullest extent possible." To fulfill the stated policy of MEPA, the agency shall conform to the applicable rules prior to reaching a final decision on proposed actions covered by MEPA. ARM 12.2.428, *Policy Statement Concerning MEPA Rules*. However, in this circumstance, MEPA's public process is impacted by a competing statutory deadline. More specifically, § 87-5-504, MCA, states:

"Within 30 days after the receipt of such plans [for a project subject to SPA 124 permitting], the department shall notify the applicant whether or not such construction project or hydraulic project will adversely affect any fish or game habitat. If the department notifies the applicant that such construction will adversely affect any fish or game habitat, it shall accompany such notice with recommendations or alternative plans which will eliminate or diminish such adverse effect."

Effectively, within 30 days after receipt of an application [for an SPA 124 Permit], FWP must make a final decision on the proposed action/project. Within the applicable 30-day timeframe, the MEPA practitioner or author of the Draft EA must conduct a rigorous process, making it difficult or impossible for FWP to accommodate a public comment period for the Draft EA within the required 30-day time-period. § 87-5-504, MCA.

- *An EA is a public document and may be inspected upon request. Any person may obtain a copy of an EA by making a request to FWP. If the document is out-of-print, a copying charge may be levied (ARM 12.2.433(2)).*
- *Public notice will be served on the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks website at: <https://fwp.mt.gov/news/public-notices>. Public notice will announce the availability of the Draft EA, summarize its content, and solicit public comment.*
- *Copies will be distributed to neighboring landowners to ensure their knowledge of the proposed project and opportunity for review and comment on the proposed action.*
- *FWP maintains a mailing list of persons interested in a particular action or type of action. FWP will notify all interested persons and distribute copies of the Draft EA to those persons for review and comment (ARM 12.2.433(3)).*
- *FWP issues a biweekly press release containing all FWP public commenting opportunities.*

XII. Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis

NO further analysis is needed for the proposed action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FWP must conduct EIS level review for the proposed action	<input type="checkbox"/>

XIII. EA Preparation and Review

	Name	Title
EA prepared by:	Kenneth M Backes	Region 7 Fisheries Manager
EA reviewed by:		

Attachment 1

SPA 124 Permit General Conditions

FWP.MT.GOV



THE **OUTSIDE** IS IN US ALL.

Stream Protection Act 124 Permit General Conditions

1. Complete work affecting a streambed or stream bank in an expeditious manner to avoid unnecessary impacts to the stream.
2. Limit the clearing of vegetation to that which is absolutely necessary for construction of the project. Take precautions to preserve existing riparian vegetation. Salvage and reuse native vegetation where possible.
3. Install and maintain erosion control measures where appropriate to protect aquatic resources. Do not clear and grub land adjacent to streams prior to installing proper erosion and sedimentation controls. Conduct all work in a manner that minimizes turbidity and other disturbances to aquatic resources.
4. Plan temporary construction facilities to:
 - a. Minimize disturbance to stream banks, stream bank vegetation, and the streambed by locating staging or storage facilities at least 50' horizontally from the highest anticipated water level during construction;
 - b. not restrict or impede fish passage in streams; and
 - c. not restrict any flow anticipated during use.
5. Provide sediment controls for drainage from topsoil stockpiles, staging areas, access roads, channel changes, and instream excavations.
6. Isolate work zones from flowing and standing waters to prevent turbid water and sediments from being discharged into streams or other drainages that flow directly into the stream. Divert flowing waters around the work zone.
7. Do not spill or dump material into streams. Store and handle petroleum products, chemicals, cement and other deleterious materials in a manner that will prevent their entering streams.
8. Do not permit wash water from cleaning concrete-related equipment or wet concrete to enter streams.
9. Do not operate mechanized equipment in any stream or flowing water unless special authorization is obtained. If special authorization is granted, the following conditions apply:
 - a. Power-wash all equipment allowed in a stream prior to entering the stream channel.
 - b. Clean and maintain all equipment so that petroleum-based products and hydraulic fluids do not leak or spill into the waterway.
10. Reclaim streambeds and stream banks as closely as possible to their pre-disturbed condition.
11. Restore disturbed stream banks to their natural or pre-disturbed configuration to match adjacent ground contours or as specified in the project plans. Stabilize, reseed, and re-vegetate disturbed areas. Install and maintain long-term biodegradable erosion-control measures to protect these areas until adequate vegetation has been established.
12. Restore temporary access routes and any temporarily disturbed areas to original conditions, including original contours and vegetation.
13. Dispose of any excess material generated from the project above the ordinary high-water mark and in an area not classified as a wetland.