

*Proposed Road Maintenance
At Designated Homesite Systems, Road Segments, and Bridges,
Tribal Roads Program
Environmental Assessment Checklist*

Proposed Road Maintenance Tribal Roads Program

Environmental Assessment Checklist

In compliance with the
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

May 2006

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes
Tribal Roads Program and
NEPA Program
Natural Resources Department
PO Box 278
Pablo, MT 59855

and
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Flathead Agency
PO Box 40
Pablo, MT 59855



CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Specifics are listed in **bold**, to facilitate tracking

- 1.1.1. **Proponent:** Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT) Natural Resources Department—Tribal Roads Program (Roads) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Program.
- 1.1.2. **Name of Project:** Programmatic Environmental Assessment to cover routine road and bridge maintenance at designated homesite road systems (16), BIA-forest road segments (37), and bridges (11).
- Major road construction, bridge replacement, or culvert installation at flowing waters would require separate NEPA documentation and appropriate permits.
- ❖ **Overall, this EA would cover relatively minor and routine activities at specified locations.**
- Snow plowing at Homesite roads;
 - Roadway grading and blading;
 - Culvert rehabilitation;
 - Culvert installation—limited to:
 - Dry draws and
 - Intermediate areas of slopes, to catch any potential runoff between longer expanses of road.
 - Other proposed culvert installation would have site-specific NEPA documentation, as well as review by the CSKT Shoreline Protection Office and the US Army Corps of Engineers.
 - Sand (applied during winter for traction) removal. In this proposal, removing sand (after the winter driving period) is referred to as ‘dust abatement’;
 - Surface overlay and chip-seal;
 - Right-of-way clearing—This may include mowing, weed removal, litter removal, slope and borrow area stabilization, fence repair, tree pruning, and grading. Right-of-way includes the road footprint plus additional space on each side, and is generally 60 feet wide at Homesite Roads and 40 feet wide for BIA Forest Roads;
 - Sign maintenance;
 - Limited bridge maintenance and repair. In the context of this EA, bridge work is often limited to replacing a guard rail or pieces of decking, for example;
 - Weed spraying—only near the Homesite Road Systems (defined below) and not in the Forest Road System (defined below).
 - Major construction or bridge replacement would require separate NEPA documentation and other permits.
- 1.1.3. **Proposed Implementation Date:** All year, depending on the site (Table 1 at the end of this document).
- 1.1.4. **Location:** Various locations throughout the Flathead Reservation (Figures 1-3. Figures are separate PDF documents.)
- **Homesite road systems.** The Tribal Roads Program maintains only certain homesite roads. These total 16 and are listed in Table 2; also see Figures H-1 through H-7.
 - **Designated bridges.** The Tribal Roads Program maintains only certain bridges (total 11, Table 3; also see Figures B-1 through B-8).
 - **BIA-Roads.** The Tribal Roads Program maintains only certain BIA-roads. These are public roads within the BIA forest road network (total 37, Table 4; also see Figures W-1 through W-5 and Figures R-1 through R-37).

1.1.5. **County:** Parts of Missoula, Lake, Flathead, and Sanders Counties.

1.2. Need for the Action (related to on-the-ground conditions):

- In general, maintenance practices...
 - Increase driver and pedestrian safety.
 - Improve environmental conditions in and around the roadway and right-of-way.
 - Operate on a seasonal schedule.
 - Save money over the long-term (10+ years and beyond) on infrastructure needs.
 - Make communities more desirable places for people to live.
 - At the Homesites, **average daily traffic (ADT)** counts are **10 to 318** vehicles per 24 hours, generally averaged over a week (TIP 2005-2009: page 4).
 - Traffic volumes are expected to increase at least 3% annually (conventionally accepted value for minimum growth).
 - At that rate, ADT counts would increase to 18 to 557 vehicles by 2020 at Homesites.
 - We estimate that 95% of the traffic at the Homesites is passenger vehicles (L. Yellow Robe, Tribal transportation planner, personal communication, June 2005).
 - School buses, motorcycles, and occasional commercial vehicles complete the remaining 5%.
 - The Tribes do not keep current traffic counts on the BIA forest roads.
 - We estimate that each BIA forest road's **ADT is 25-50** vehicles per day, of which 25% is commercial traffic (L. Yellow Robe, Tribal transportation planner, personal communication, June 2005).
 - Similar to Homesite roads, BIA forest roads would increase at least 3% annually.

1.3. Purpose (objectives), and related documents:

- NEPA documentation is currently either case-by-case (chip seal projects, for example), or not handled.
- Documents that provide guidance:
 - Flathead Reservation Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), 2005-2009 (CSKT 2005: p. 5).
 - Comprehensive Resources Plan (CSKT 1994: Volume 2, page II.4-26), Residential Areas—Goal: “Encourage housing development and **maintenance** that considers human resource values while protecting natural resource qualities and minimizing impacts to community infrastructure.”
 - Comprehensive Resources Plan (CSKT 1994: Volume 2, page II.4-27), Residential Area Policies—Long-term Objectives:
 - “Encourage the use of buffering, landscaping, and construction designs, as appropriate, to **maintain natural qualities** and minimize land use conflicts.”
 - “Promote development that **maintains open space**, protects sensitive areas, reduces land use conflicts, yet maintains some privacy for residents.”
 - Continue to emphasize and **enhance safety** in the development of residential areas.”
 - Comprehensive Resources Plan (CSKT 1994: Volume 2, page II.4-31), Transportation, Communication, and Utilities—Five-year Objectives:
 - “Explore avenues of cooperation between Tribal, federal, and local governments for continued **road maintenance** and construction planning that includes land use and sign controls to protect scenic and other natural resource values, enhance traffic safety, and accommodate sound growth.”
 - “Pursue and facilitate transportation enhancement projects to protect scenic and other resource values and **improve safety**.”
 - Comprehensive Resources Plan (CSKT 1994: Volume 2, page II.4-31), Transportation, Communication, and Utilities —Long-term Objectives:

continued

continued

- “Continue to require and participate in development of environmental studies and road management plans to establish construction, reclamation, mitigation, **maintenance**, and closure requirements that protect resource values and minimize environmental damages.”
 - “Continue work to ensure roads are **well-marked** and have adequate access, especially to assist emergency vehicle response.”
 - “Continue with a site planning process for designing residential street improvements that respond to community needs for lighting, on and off street parking, curbs and gutters, and sidewalks and bike paths, to **enhance pedestrian and traffic safety**.”
 - “Encourage landscaping, buffering, and construction designs for transportation, communication, and utility corridors and facilities that are **compatible with the natural features** of the surrounding environment.”
- The 1997 Flathead Reservation Transportation Plan. A plan objective includes, “**safe and efficient public access** within the Reservation.” (1997 Flathead Reservation Transportation Plan, Summary, p. i).
- BIA Manual (BIAM) 58. USDI 1972. “The policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ (BIA) Road Maintenance Program is to preserve, repair, and restore the BIA system of roadways.” (BIAM 57, 1. General, 1.1 Policy).

1.4. **Related laws** and regulations, and other agencies involved:

- The Tribal Wildlife Management and Fisheries Management Programs would assess effects to threatened and endangered species, to determine if consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service—as required by the **Endangered Species Act**—would be needed.
- The proponent would contact the **Shoreline Protection Office**, in compliance with Ordinance 87A and 64A.
- The proponent would contact the **Army Corps of Engineers** to determine if a 404 permit would be needed.
- The Tribal Water Quality Program would determine if a **Storm Water** Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Notice of Intent (to the US EPA) would be needed.

1.5. **Decisions** to be made: The Tribes and the Superintendent must decide if more analysis needed, or if the action can go forward with this level of analysis.

I PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1.6. SUMMARIZE SCOPING, EXPLAIN RELEVANT ISSUES: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

During fall 2004, the Tribal Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) was scoped for issues. No issues beyond implementing best management practices were identified.

- The proposal was advertised for 2 weeks each, in the Lake Co. Leader, CharKoosta, and Sanders County newspapers.
- No public comments were received.

<p>1.7. LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic Lands Conservation Ordinance (ALCO) Permit. No permit would be required for routine road maintenance. The proponent would seek ALCO permits when culverts that affect the bed and banks of streams would be replaced (memo attached). • Cultural Clearance permit (Tribal Ordinance 95). Clearances were received and they have been scanned in a separate PDF document. • 404 permit—The Army Corps of Engineers was contacted during January 2006. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No permits would be needed. • Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads, culverts, and drainage systems are already in place. • No ground would be disturbed, other than blading existing roads. • Maintenance was designed to enhance drainage, using Best Management Practices (Section 2). • Water Quality Program would determine if work at specific roads would need a SWPPP. If so, the proponent would prepare the SWPPP and the NOI at that time.
<p>2.0. Description of the Alternatives Alternative A No action</p> <p><i>Continued below</i></p>	<p>Alternative A, No Action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Road maintenance would likely continue with no NEPA documentation in place. ➤ This would not preclude proposing this or other actions at some future time.

<p><i>Alternatives, continued</i></p> <p>2.0. Description of the Alternatives</p> <p>Alternative B Proposed Action</p>	<p>Alternative B, Proposed Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Snow plowing at Homesite roads; ➤ Roadway grading and blading; ➤ Culvert rehabilitation; ➤ Culvert installation—limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry draws and • Intermediate areas of slopes, to catch any potential runoff between longer expanses of road. • Other proposed culvert installation would have site-specific NEPA documentation, as well as review by the CSKT Shoreline Protection Office and the US Army Corps of Engineers. ➤ Road sand removal; ➤ Surface overlay and chip-seal; ➤ Right-of-way clearing—This may include mowing, weed removal, litter removal, slope and borrow area stabilization, fence repair, tree pruning, and grading. Right-of-way includes the road footprint plus additional space on each side, and is generally 60 feet wide at Homesite Roads and 40 feet wide for BIA Forest Roads; ➤ Sign maintenance; ➤ Limited bridge maintenance and repair. In the context of this EA, bridge work is often limited to replacing a guard rail or pieces of decking, for example; ➤ Weed spraying—only near the Homesite Road Systems and not in the Forest Road System. ➤ Major construction or bridge replacement would require separate NEPA documentation and other permits. <p>Sites include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 37 BIA forest roads that total ~ 379.4 miles (Table 4). ➤ 16 Homesite road systems that total ~ 20 miles (Table 2). ➤ ~ 18.5 miles of sidewalk associated with the Homesite road systems ➤ ~ 1 mile pedestrian pathway (Arlee Town site to the Tribal Homesite) ➤ 11 bridges (Table 3). ➤ The above does <i>not</i> include Salish-Kootenai College Streets ➤ The above does <i>not</i> include driveways or roads to individual homes or allotments. ➤ The above does <i>not</i> include the only Homesite that is maintained by the Salish Kootenai Housing Authority (SKHA)—the Felsman Addition, located in Pablo (Bud Gillan, SKHA, personal communication). ➤ Timberlane Pathway, fiscal year 2005 or 2006. This would be new construction, but would <i>not</i> be covered under this EA. ➤ Dixon-Agency proposed reconstruction, scheduled for fiscal year 2008. Maintenance would be covered under this EA, both now and after reconstruction.
--	--

Alternative B, continued

Water Quality Mitigation Measures

- If maintenance is expected to affect the bed and banks of any water body, then the Roads Program Manager would apply for the appropriate permit through the Shoreline Protection Office (ALCO for rivers and streams, and Shoreline for Flathead Lake).
- When a seal coat is applied to a Homesite road, the Maintenance Program would close one travel lane, to allow the seal coat to bond properly to the surface and prevent asphalt from adhering to car tires.
- Remove the sand and gravel from paved roads as soon as practicable, which lessens the likelihood of sand and gravel moving into nearby water resources.
- Site-specific areas of interest have been listed by the Fisheries Program (**Table 8**). When work occurs in those sites, the Fisheries Program would be notified.
- Right-of-way clearing would avoid wetland sites. If wetlands were to be disturbed, then the IDT would be consulted, and mitigation would be implemented according to the Tribal Wetlands Conservation Plan and regulations from the Army Corps of Engineers.

Improvements to Best Management Practices (BMPs):

1. Insure that contractors read and understand the BMPs, and insure that BMPs are adhered to.
2. For any roadway area located within **50 feet** of a stream, do not sidecast road material or locate road material in a berm along the road. If necessary, outhaul material with a backhoe or other equipment.
3. **Clean** dips and crossdrains, repair ditches, and clear debris from culverts during maintenance activities.
4. Schedule regular preventative maintenance programs for high-risk sites (**Table 8**).
5. Conduct road surface maintenance on a schedule sufficient to minimize erosion of the surface and subgrade.
6. Maintain the road surface in a crowned or **out-sloped** condition.
7. Keep the downhill side of the road free from berms.

Mitigations to address Bald Eagles

- **Control disturbance** between **Feb. 1-Aug. 15** at the east end of road # **2150** (Upper Dry Fork Road).
- It is possible to conduct maintenance operations if the wildlife program determines that the pair is inactive.
- The **earliest time** to conduct work if the nest were found to be inactive would be approximately **mid-May**.

Mitigations in Grizzly Bear Habitat (Figure 4):

- Conduct proposed forest road activity during the summer (**June 15 to Sept. 15**).
 - The Turtle Lake, Pablo, Park Addition, and Arlee Homesites are located within the Transitional Grizzly Bear Habitat.
 - The Pache, Woodcock and Clarice Paul Homesites are located within **Management Situation (MS) III** Habitat.
 - The Schley Homesite is within **MS II** Habitat.
 - All homesites are currently affected by human disturbance and activity.
 - Therefore, snowplowing and street sweeping may occur at homesites outside of the above-listed dates.
- Store food and garbage in **bear-proof containers** and **remove** from the site **daily**.
- **No firearms** allowed on the job site.
- Immediately **report sightings** of grizzly bears or bear sign to the CSKT Wildlife Management Program or CSKT Game Wardens.

<p>Mitigations for Snow Plowing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identified concern—placement of snow stockpiles. ➤ Melting at snow stockpile areas can introduce sediment and road oils into water bodies. ➤ Locate snow stockpiles away from <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. open water-bodies, and 2. open sewer grates, manholes, or other features that would route melting snow into a stormwater collection system. <p>Mitigations for Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Remove the sand and gravel from paved roads as soon as practicable. ➤ Street sweeping also lessens the likelihood of sand and gravel moving into nearby water resources. 	
---	--

<p>2.1. OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No other alternatives were considered. ➤ If other areas would be proposed for maintenance, then additional NEPA documents would be prepared at that time.
---	--

II. EFFECTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
(Chapter 3)

<p><u>Definitions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The project area includes the immediate area that would experience road maintenance (Figures 1-3). ➤ Direct and Indirect Effects (<i>from</i> CEQ regulations in Title 40 CFR §1508.8) accrue in the project area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct effects: are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. • Indirect effects: are caused by the action and occur later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. ➤ The cumulative effects analysis area (CEAA) is defined by and appropriate to relevant issues. ❖ For this proposal, the CEAA was defined as the Flathead Reservation (Figure 6). ➤ Cumulative effects (<i>from</i> CEQ regulations in Title 40 CF §1508.7) accrue in the CEAA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative effects: result from the incremental effects from the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency, group, or person undertakes them. ➤ In the CEAA for this proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Current miles of roads in the CEAA are summarized in Table 5. ➤ Potential future homesite road areas are listed in Table 6. ➤ Future road-building on Tribal lands would go through the NEPA process. ➤ New roads can be expected on Fee lands, especially those located near urban centers. ➤ The Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) performs maintenance, snow removal and sanding along major highways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ US Highway 93, and ➤ Montana 200, 28, 35, 77, 211, 212, 352, 354, and 382. ➤ The Counties perform limited maintenance along main roads, and if funding allows, along other routes most in need. ➤ The CSKT Forestry Department builds and maintains roads at active timber sales. 	
---	--

RESOURCE	POTENTIAL EFFETS
<p>3.1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactable or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>❖ With mitigation measures and design features in place (Section 2.0), there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to soils or geology as a result of the proposed road maintenance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The roads, homesites, and bridges where maintenance would occur are already in place. ➤ Negative effects to soil or geology as a result of building the structures have already occurred. ➤ Rights-of-ways would remain vegetated and stable, even if clearing would occur.
<p>3.2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?</p>	<p>❖ With mitigation measures and design features in place (Section 2.0), there would be no measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to water quality as a result of the proposed road maintenance.</p> <p>Affected Environment: <i>See</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Table 7. Curb and gutter configuration at homesites. ➤ Table 8. Homesites and roads, adjacent waterways, and fish or other species of interest present. ➤ See all Figures, especially <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rds-Fig 1—37 and • HS-Fig 1—6 <p><i>Continued, below</i></p>
<p><i>Water quality, continued</i></p> <p>Mechanism of delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Roads can decrease water quality by storm water runoff that contains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sand and chemicals from road maintenance • Oil • Gasoline • Grease • Heavy metals • Antifreeze • Tire rubber • Asphalt flakes. • Fine sediments • Elevated temperatures • Chemical spills <p><i>continued</i></p>	

Mechanism of delivery, continued

Seal Coat

- Seal coats are applied to numerous paved roads at the Tribal homesites each spring or summer
- The seal coat provides the pavement a better moisture barrier, but this also increases storm water run-off.
- Seal coats are not laid during cold or rainy weather, because the asphalt's viscosity and bonding properties are reduced between the pavement, asphalt, and the rock (Washington Department of Transportation, Planning, Research, and Public Transportation Division. *Asphalt Seal Coats*. Olympia, Washington. November 1987).

Asphalt

- Asphalt is placed directly on the pavement surface and almost immediately bonds with the pavement and rock.
- Asphalt will stick to vehicle tires that travel across a freshly applied seal coat surface.
- Once the asphalt dries, it can flake off the tires and fall to the roadway surface.
- These asphalt flakes can move into near by water sources, either through stormwater run-off or wind

Grading and Maintenance

- Grading and maintenance of unpaved forest roads can result in the delivery of substantial quantities of sediment to streams.
- Failure to remove berms created by grading typically prevents water from escaping the road surface, resulting in concentrated flow and erosion.
- Improper maintenance of water diversion features in the road bed also causes erosion.
- Improper maintenance of stream crossings can cause erosion of the roadfill material, or ponding above the roadfill that may result in diversion of streamflow onto the road surface.
- This usually results in severe erosion.

Storm water runoff from roadways can contribute to...

- Increased Sedimentation
- Turbidity
- Fluctuating stream flow levels

Given the above

- We assess specific sites that may present problems related to maintenance.
- Fisheries Program has determined which roads would potentially affect fisheries of interest (**Table 8**).
- **Homesites located near streams** or wetlands include:
 - **Dixon-Agency Homesite** and the Flathead River (**Figure HS-1**).
 1. Of 5 homesites without curb and gutter (Dixon-Agency, Turtle Lake, Schley, Alexander Lane, and Dog Lake, **Table 7**), only one—Dixon Agency—occurs relatively close to a flowing stream.
 2. The road is approximately 30 m (~ 98 feet) from the river, at the closest point.
 3. There is buffering vegetation and a house located between the homesite road and the river.
 4. Overall, there is relatively little chance for sand delivery to the river under average conditions.
 - **Turtle Lake Homesite** and Turtle Lake (**Figure HS-4**)
 1. The main road is parallel to the lake, but distant. A pioneered road is adjacent to the lake, but the road would not be maintained.

Continued below

Water quality, continued

- **Salish Homesite** and Mission Creek (**Figure HS-6**).
 1. A portion of the homesite is near Mission Creek, but the roads are not adjacent.

 - **Mission Dam** and Mission Creek (**Figure HS-6**).
 1. A portion of the homesite is near Mission Creek, but the roads are not adjacent.

 - **Clarice Paul** and a wetland to the west (**Figure HS-5**).
 1. The road is parallel to a wetland for 81 m (366 feet), but the distance between them is 14 m (46 feet) and is vegetated.

 - **Pache Homesite** and a wetland (**Figure HS-5**).
 1. The road leads to a sewage lagoon, but stops short of the wetland to the south.

 - **Woodcock Homesite** and a wetland (**Figure HS-5**).
 1. The road is 22 m (72 feet) distant, and there is vegetation between the road and the wetland.
- ❖ Overall, the above-listed features would buffer any potential discharge from the proposed road maintenance to the stream or wetland.

Water quality, continued

- Roads located near streams or wetlands and *not* identified by the Fisheries program (**Table 8**) include:
- 122—Elmo Truck Trail (**Figure Rd-5**).
 - A relatively small portion of the road is adjacent to a small portion of a larger wetland.
 - At the closest, the road is ~41 m (135 feet) from the wetland.
 - Vegetation between the 2 would act as a buffer between the road and the wetland.

 - 157—Selow Creek (**Figure Rd-18**).
 - A small wetland in the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) data set is not evident on a 1998 color air photo at ~ 1:12,000 scale.
 - Likely, the wetland does not exist.

 - 164—Clear Creek (**Figure Rd-19**).
 - There are no fish in the Upper Clear Creek in the forest –the area is too heavily altered (B Hansen, Fisheries Management Program).
 - Clear Creek goes dry in the valley, but picks up flow near where it meets the river.
 - There are fish in the lower part of Clear Creek, but negative effects have already occurred by building the road in the riparian area.

 - 215—Claus Mine (**Figure Rd-24**).
 - The stream that is indicated in the data base is actually a dry draw (BH).

Continued below

Water quality, continued

- 301—Sunny Slope (**Figure Rd-26**).
 - 2 portions of road that total 1,160 m (1,268 yards) are adjacent to an unnamed stream.
 - This road only represents a fraction of the total miles of road in the surrounding sections (Figure R-26).
- 1885—Station Creek Road (**Figure Rd-36**).
 - A portion of the road (536 m or 586 yards) is adjacent to the stream, but it is located very high up the drainage.
 - Effects of the limited amount of maintenance in this proposal would not be measurable.

❖ Because ...

- The above-listed features would buffer any potential discharge from the proposed road maintenance to nearby streams or wetlands;
- Homesites either have curb-and-gutter or are otherwise buffered from live streams or sensitive sites;
- Effects were minimized to the greatest extent practicable, by design features and mitigation measures (**Section 2.0**);
- Road maintenance is relatively limited among all potential agencies on the Reservation;
- Most of the negative effects to streams or wetlands have already occurred, by building the roads in riparian areas;
- Maintenance in this proposal is relatively minor, and does not include construction or culvert replacement in live streams;
- Site-specific areas of interest have been listed by the Fisheries Program. When work occurs in those sites, the Fisheries Program would be notified;
- Given the cumulative miles of road already present (Figure 6), it would not be possible to measure the potentially slight effects from the limited maintenance in this proposal;

❖ Therefore, with mitigation measures and design features in place (**Section 2.0**), there would be **no measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to water quality** as a result of the proposed road maintenance.

3.3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?

- ❖ No measurable **direct, indirect, or cumulative effects** to air quality with mitigation measures and design features (**Section 2.0**) in place.
- Effects were minimized to the greatest extent practicable, by design features that
- Remove road sand during spring.
 - Use of construction best management practices.

<p>3.4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Low potential for direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to native vegetative communities, with mitigation measures and design features (Section 2.0) in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Infrastructure is already in place, and vegetation cover has already been substantially altered. ➤ Limited wetland and riparian habitats occur adjacent to some sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See water quality (Section 3.2) above ➤ Generally, it would be unlikely for rare plants or cover types to occur in the road right-of-way. ➤ Right-of-way clearing would avoid wetland sites. If wetlands were to be disturbed, then the IDT would be consulted, and mitigation would be implemented according to the Tribal Wetlands Conservation Plan and regulations from the Army Corps of Engineers.
<p>3.5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Low potential for direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to important fish and wildlife habitats and species, with mitigation measures and design features (Section 2.0) in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Infrastructure is already in place, and habitats have already been altered and fragmented by roads. ➤ Maintenance would not further affect these habitats, except in a relatively minor way—at low levels, in localized areas, and for short-time duration (G. Barce memo, 29 Sept 2005, at the end of this document). ➤ Sensitive fisheries areas have been addressed by revising BMPs (Section 2.0, and B. Hansen memo, 29 Sept 2005, attached). ➤ Fisheries Program has determined which roads would potentially affect fisheries of interest (Table 8), and the program would be advised when work would occur at those sites. ➤ Mitigations to address grizzly bears and bald eagles have been incorporated into the alternative (Section 2.0).
<p>3.6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ There would be no measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to important wildlife and fisheries habitats or to wildlife and fisheries populations from the proposal, with mitigation measures and design features (Section 2.0) in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Grizzly bears and bald eagles occur in the vicinity of some of the roads and homesites (Figure 4 and 5-1 through 5-3). ➤ Mitigation measures for grizzly bears and bald eagles were designed into the alternative (Section 2.0). ➤ Bull trout and west slope cutthroat trout occur in some of the waterways in the vicinity of some roads, homesites, and bridges (Table 8). ➤ Sites of importance to the Fisheries Program have been designated (Table 8). ➤ Wetlands have been mapped in the vicinity of a limited number of sites (Section 3.4) ➤ Any effects to wildlife and fisheries from maintenance would be low-level and localized in the immediate vicinity of the action. ➤ Effects would not be measurable at the population level. ➤ See information from the Wildlife Management and Fisheries Management Programs at the end of this document.

<p>3.7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ There would be no measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to historical sites from the proposal, with mitigation measures and design features (Section 2.0) in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Tribal Preservation Office reviewed the proposal. ➤ Roads, bridges, and homesite systems are already in place, so that effects to resources have already occurred. ➤ Cultural clearances are attached (separate PDF document).
<p>3.8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to aesthetics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Infrastructure is already in place, and aesthetics have already been altered and fragmented by roads. ➤ Maintenance would not further affect these areas, except in a relatively minor way—at low levels, in localized sites, and for short duration. ➤ Maintenance would not create excessive light or noise.
<p>3.9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR, OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects or demands on environmental resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Infrastructure is already in place, and environmental resources have already been used in that process. ➤ Maintenance would not further affect these resources, except in a relatively minor way—at low levels, in localized sites, and for short duration. ➤ No limited resources would be used by the proposal. ➤ Nearby activities would include small-town and rural lifestyle activities. None of these would affect the proposal. ➤ If the homesites grew, then the demand for maintenance, especially snow removal, would increase. ➤ Increased work that would change the effects listed in this document would require amending this EA.

III. EFFECTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

<p>3.10. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documents related to transportation are listed in Section 1.3, above. ➤ There are many other environmental documents that cover portions of the project areas and CEAA. The following lists the most recent of these. (The list is not inclusive, because 1) a comprehensive list of Reservation-wide NEPA documents would be too long to list here, and 2) the NEPA Program does not have information from other Programs that may prepare their own NEPA documents.) ➤ Pablo streets proposed road improvement project, Environmental Assessment and FONSI 7 May 2005. ➤ Elmo streets east—proposed paving, sidewalks, and other improvements, Environmental Assessment Checklist 9 June 2005. ➤ Proposed guardrail, resurfacing, and French drain, South Valley Creek Road, Categorical Exclusion Checklist, 29 July 2005. ➤ Chip sealing for selected roads, Categorical Exclusion Checklist 19 August 2002. ➤ Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Homesite Leasing and Development on the Flathead Reservation. Tribal Lands Department, 22 December 2000. ➤ Three Jocko Rover Bridge Replacements, Checklist Environmental Assessment 9 September 2002.
---	---

<p>3.11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ There would be slight beneficial direct and indirect benefits to health and safety in the project areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposal should slightly improve health and safety, by maintaining the roads in a safe condition. ➤ Effects would be localized to wherever the improvements or plowing occurred. ➤ There would be no measurable cumulative effects, until more extensive maintenance or plowing were planned in other roads the CEAA.
<p>3.12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on commercial uses. Because <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The area is relatively remote, and ➤ The maintenance is limited and localized, ➤ We conclude that the proposal would likely not promote industrial uses.
<p>3.13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move, or eliminate jobs? If so estimated number.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on employment. Because <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The area is relatively remote, and ➤ The maintenance is limited and localized, ➤ We conclude that the proposal would likely not create or move jobs.
<p>3.14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[N]</p>
<p>3.15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on the demand for services from this proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ While traffic is steadily increasing, the area is relatively remote and can only sustain limited growth. ➤ The limited maintenance proposed in this project would not affect growth patterns. ➤ While other services may be needed in the future, the growth would occur regardless of the limited maintenance proposed in this project.
<p>3.16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?</p>	<p>Lake County is currently addressing growth management with the proposed Lake County Density Map and Regulations (Dec 2004, available at http://www.lakecountymt.org/planning/Lake_County_Density_Map.html).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The limited maintenance proposed in this project would have no effect on local environmental plans and goals.

<p>3.17. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on access to recreation or wilderness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wilderness is accessible on the east side of the Reservation. ➤ Recreation occurs along the Flathead River and Flathead Lake. ➤ The limited maintenance proposed in this project would not affect access to any of those activities. ➤ Recreation potential would not be affected by the proposal.
<p>3.18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to housing demand. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Housing is already in place in the project areas. ➤ The limited maintenance proposed in this project would not affect the demand for housing on the Reservation. ➤ Potential development in the CEAA would require its own NEPA documentation, including plans for road maintenance.
<p>3.19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ No measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to social structures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Infrastructure is already in place in the project areas and CEAA. ➤ Lifestyles were disrupted when the infrastructures were built. ➤ Native lifestyles could still occur in the open space surrounding the project areas or in the CEAA. ➤ The limited maintenance proposed in this project would not further disrupt traditional lifestyles.
<p>3.20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?</p>	<p>[N] Effects would be the same as Section 3.19.</p>
<p>3.21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES: Is there a potential for other future uses for the area other than for the proposed type of management? Is future use hypothetical?</p>	<p>[N] Effects would be the same as Section 3.19.</p>
<p>4.10. LIST UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Road maintenance would have unavoidable effects during the time of work implementation (Table 1), with increased noise, dust, and traffic congestion. ➤ Effects would be mitigated as much as possible, through the design features and mitigations listed in the proposed action alternative (Section 2.0).
<p>4.11. RELATIONSHIP OF SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Short-term uses of the area would be disrupted during the time of work implementation (Table 1). ➤ Asphalt and chip sealing can be laid over a 5-10 day period, so that residents could still access their homes. ➤ Long-term uses (> 1 year after implementation at a given site) would be enhanced by the planned improvements.

<p>4.12. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES</p>	<p>Irreversible losses (those that can not be undone) would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The use of fuel and materials used in the maintenance (sand, chip seal, asphalt, guardrail, bridge decking, etc.). ➤ The irreversible loss of open space to road infrastructure has already occurred, because the roads are already in place. <p>Irretrievable losses (those that would be lost for a period of time) would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The loss of relative peace and quiet during implementation of maintenance activities. ➤ Compared to the reconstruction of U.S. Highway 93, which is scheduled to occur from 2004-2010, the irretrievable loss of quiet due to this road maintenance proposal would be relatively un-identifiable.
<p>4.13. ANY OTHER DISCLOSURES</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>5.0 LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Agencies: <i>see Section 1.4</i>, above. Also ➤ Lake County Planning Office—Sue Shannon, 883-7235 ➤ Lake County Roads—Bob Smith, 883-7206 ➤ Missoula County Office of Planning and Grants, Mike Kress, Transportation Planner (406) 258-4931 ➤ Dave Prescott, Transportation Planner, Missoula Co., (406) 258-4676 <p>Individuals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Rose Leach, NEPA Program Manager, CSKT Natural Resources Dept (NRD) ➤ Lewis Yellow Robe, Tribal Transportation Planner, Tribal Roads Department, NRD. ➤ Mike Brown, Professional Engineer, Tribal Roads Program Manager, NRD. ➤ Janet Camel, Division of Lands ➤ Seth Makepeace, Tribal Hydrologist, NRD ➤ Dan Lipscomb, Shoreline Protection, NRD ➤ George Barce, Wildlife Management Program, NRD ➤ Brett Gullett, Wildlife Management Program, NRD ➤ Barry Hansen, Fisheries Program, NRD ➤ Mike Durglo, Water Quality, CSKT ➤ Sue Ball, Wetlands Coordinator, CSKT

EA Checklist Prepared by: <u>/s/ Rosemary H. Leach</u> <u>10 May 2006</u>	
Signature: <u>Rosemary H. Leach,</u> NEPA Program Manager	Date
IV. FINDING	
ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Alternative B , the Proposed Action
LEVEL OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS:	Finding of No Significant Impact to Resources, with mitigation and design features in place.
Need for Further Environmental Analysis: <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis Needed	
EA Checklist Approved by: <u>/s/ Ernest T. Moran</u> <u>11 May 2006</u>	
Signature: <u>Ernest T. Moran,</u> Superintendent, Flathead Agency	Date

Attachments

List of Tables

- Table 1. Timing of activities
- Table 2. List of homesites covered in this document
- Table 3. List of bridges covered in this document
- Table 4. List of roads covered in this document
- Table 5. Miles of road, by jurisdiction and surface-type, within the Flathead Indian Reservation (2005).
- Table 6. Proposed future homesite road segments.
- Table 7. Curb and gutter configuration at homesites.
- Table 8. Homesite and roads, adjacent waterways, and fish or other species of interest present, Flathead Indian Reservation, 2005.
- Table 9. Fish species names and abbreviations

- Scanned Signature Page
- Scanned Cultural Clearances are in a separate PDF
- Maps are separate PDF Documents.
- **List of Figures is on page 33.**

Memos from Interdisciplinary Team Members

- Shoreline Protection Office
- Wildlife Management Program
- Fisheries Management Program
- Construction Best Management Practices—BMPS (separate pdf document)
- Contractor's Special Provisions to Address Whirling Disease, separate pdf document.

Proposed Road Maintenance
At Designated Homesite Systems, Road Segments, and Bridges,
Tribal Roads Program
Environmental Assessment Checklist

Proposed Road Maintenance
At Designated Homesite Systems, Road Segments, and Bridges,
Tribal Roads Program
Environmental Assessment Checklist

EA Checklist Prepared by: <u>Rosemary H. Leach</u> <u>10 May 2006</u>	
Signature: Rosemary H. Leach, NEPA Program Manager	Date
IV. FINDING	
ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Alternative B, the Proposed Action
LEVEL OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS:	Finding of No Significant Impact to Resources, with mitigation and design features in place.
Need for Further Environmental Analysis: <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis Needed	
EA Checklist Approved by: <u>[Signature]</u> <u>5-11-06</u>	
Signature: Ernest T. Moran, Superintendent, Flathead Agency	Date

Attachments

Table 1. Timing of Proposed Road Maintenance Activities, Flathead Indian Reservation, 2006

Season	Type of activity	Location Homesite = Homesite road system (n = 16) BIA FR= any BIA forest road (n = 37)
Spring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear winter traction sand and small gravel. ➤ Repair or replace traffic signs 	Homesite
Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear right-of-ways of debris and foliage, to improve safety and sight distance. 	Homesite and BIA FR
Summer	Based on need, treat paved roads with an overlay or chip seal.	Any paved Homesite road in need (No BIA FRs are paved).
Summer	Based on need, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Grade or blade roads, ➤ Improve right-of-way (see “what” above) ➤ Install, repair, or replace culverts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potentially, any BIA FR ➤ Generally we (Tribal Roads) identify 1-3 per year ➤ BIA FRs should be on a 3-5 year improvement schedule, but not enough funds are available for this frequency.
Spring and Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Repair bridge ➤ Signage ➤ Guardrail ➤ Decking 	Any system bridge (n = 11)
Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inventory road and bridge signs ➤ Assess surface conditions 	Any Homesite or BIA FR
Winter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Plow snow ➤ Apply traction sand 	All Homesite, as needed. Rarely, any BIA FR

Table 2. Homesite roads covered in this document

List Number	BIA Route Number	Name of Homesite	Length (Miles)	Figure Number and Figure Name ¹
1	2	Dixon Agency	1.2	H-1—Dixon
2.	3	Arlee (includes the Arlee pedestrian pathway)	1.9	H-2—Jocko
3	4	Elmo	1.6	H-3—Flathead Lake
4	5	Dayton	0.1	H-3—Flathead Lake
5	6	Turtle Lake (Polson)	2.6	H-4—Turtle Lake
6	7	Pablo	2.2	H-5—Crow
7	8	Clarice Paul (Ronan)	0.5	H-5—Crow
8	9	Woodcock (Ronan)	1.1	H-5—Crow
9	10	Salish (St. Ignatius)	2.6	H-6—Mission
10	12	Mission Dam	1.1	H-6—Mission
11	13	Schley (Evaro)	1.9	H-2—Jocko
12	14	Pache (Ronan)	1.2	H-5—Crow
13	15	Park Addition (Ronan)	0.5	H-5—Crow
14	16	Willow Wynn (Pablo)	0.8	H-5—Crow
15	17	Alexander Lane (Elmo) ²	0.2	H-3—Flathead Lake
16	300-186	Dog Lake Road (Hot Springs)	0.5	H-7—Dog Lake
Total Length (Miles)			20.00	

¹Figures are separate PDF documents

² Alexander Lane is a road with a chip seal coat to 4 homes near Elmo. It was included with Homesites for analysis purposes.

Table 3. Bridges covered in this document

List Number	Bridge Number ¹	Name of Homesite	Figure Number and Figure Name
1	837	Mill Creek - Camas	B-1—Little Bitterroot
2.	837/844	Mill Pocket - Camas	B-1—Little Bitterroot
3	828/843	West Magpie Creek	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
4	826/841	Revais Creek	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
5	825	Middle Fork Revais Creek	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
6	824	E. Fork Revais Creek	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
7	820	South Fork Valley Creek	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
8	819	Middle Fork Jocko River	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
9	818/842	North Fork Jocko River	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
10	814/840	Hicks Creek	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity
11	816	Dry Creek Canal	B-2—Jocko and Vicinity

¹When a bridge is rebuilt, it is renumbered. If 2 numbers are listed, then they are in the sequence old # / new #

*Proposed Road Maintenance
At Designated Homesite Systems, Road Segments, and Bridges,
Tribal Roads Program
Environmental Assessment Checklist*

Table 4. Roads covered in this proposal.

BIA Route ¹	Route Name	Length (Miles)	Count
112	Seepay Truck Trail	8.8	1
114	Morigeau Gulch	10.6	2
115	Vanderburg Truck Trail	6	3
116	Welcome Springs	4.7	4
122	Elmo Truck Trail	26.9	5
123	Valley Creek Road	28.0	6
125	North Crow Creek Road	1.3	7
126	McDonald Lake	1.6	8
127	Mill Pocket	8.2	9
130	Magpie Truck Trail	15.5	10
132	Garden Creek	4	11
133	McGinnis Truck Trail	4.7	12
134	Camas West	13.5	13
142	Camas South	6.5	14
145	Pistol Creek Ridge	9.8	15
146	Houle Road	4.4	16
150	Camas East	10.3	17
157	Selow Creek	7.1	18
164	Clear Creek	5.4	19
165	Irvine Flats	17.1	20
166	Revais Creek	20.4	21
188	Boulder Loop Road	31.4	22
202	Divide Road	27.0	23
215	Claus Mine	10.0	24
217	Saddle Mountain Road	7.8	25
301	Sunny Slope Road	8.3	26
408	South Valley Cr Rd Guardrail	0.1	27
1012	Jocko Prairie Road	10.6	28
1015	Jocko Lakes Road	12.5	29
1021	Mill Creek Road	9.8	30
1023	Mill Pocket West	3.6	31
1114	Pistol Creek Road	19.5	32
1200	Big Draw	4.3	33
1281	Bassoo Ridge	5.1	34
1282	North Clear Creek Road	6.5	35
1885	Station Creek Road	2.5	36
2150	Upper Dry Fork Road	5.6	37
Total		379.4	

Cumulative Effects Analysis Area: Total Roads within the Flathead Reservation, Figure 5

Other Tribal Entities

- Division of Forestry
- Salish-Kootenai Housing Authority
- Salish -Kootenai College
- Division of Lands

Incorporated Town Sites:

- Ronan,
- Polson,
- St. Ignatius, and
- Hot Springs

Counties:

- Missoula,
- Flathead,
- Lake, and
- Sanders

Other governmental:

- U.S. Forest Service (USFS),
- Montana Department of Transportation (MDT),
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)—
National Bison Range

Table 5. Miles of road, by jurisdiction and surface-type, within the Flathead Indian Reservation (2005).

Responsible Agency	Gravel ¹	Bladed ²	Earth ³	Paved	Total Miles
BIA Urban Streets	0.5	0	0	19.5	20.0
BIA Forest Roads	16.6	15.3	347.5	0	379.4
Tribal, non-public roads	18.7	0	13.9	0	32.6
Tribal Forestry	3,424.5	0	0	0	3,424.5
MDT/FHWA	0	0	0	254.5	254.5
Lake Co.	476.8	15.0	3.4	189.4	684.6
Sanders Co.	139.7	0	25.5	36.6	201.8
Missoula Co.	15.1	0	0	0.5	15.6
Flathead Co.	16.6	0	0	0	16.6
City Streets (within the 4 incorporated cities)	0	0	0	12.6	12.6
Forest Service	4.0	0	0	0	4.0
USFWS (Bison Range)	19.81	0	25	1.83	46.64
Total	4,133.31	30.3	415.3	514.93	5,092.84

¹Gravel = a dirt base with gravel on top of it.

²Bladed = impromptu, roughed in with a dozer blade

³Earth = pioneered, a “two-track”.

Table 6. Proposed future homesite road segments. These sites are listed to display potential future cumulative effects only. Proposals to build these segments would have their own NEPA documentation.

BIA Route ¹	Route Name of Potential Future Segments	Length (Miles)	Count
299	Timberlane Road	5.0	1
400	Chief Martin Charlo Homesite	0.7	2
401	Hughes Road	0.4	3
402	Beckwith Lots	0.3	4
403	South Valley Creek Homesites	0.3	5
404	Nancy Joseph Homesites	0.3	6
405	Big Arm Townsite	1.7	7
406	Mission Creek Ranch Homesite	1.0	8
407	Mountain View Homesite	0.2	9
409	Elmo East	0.6	10
410	Pablo Streets	1.0	11
411	College Streets	0.8	12
412	Mollman Pass Trail	1.5	13
413	Maggie Ashley Court	0.8	14
414	South Arlee Homesite	0.5	15
415	Ktunaxa Homesite	0.7	16
416	Ronan Streets	0.2	17
417	Terrace Lake Road	1.7	18
418	Hot Springs Homesites	0.2	19
	Total potential future	17.9	

Table 7. Curb and gutter arrangements at homesites. Roads with curb and gutter have lower potential delivery of sand to adjacent side slopes, compared to roads without curb and gutter.

Homesite or Road Name	Curb and Gutter Present (Y/N) ¹
Dixon Agency	N ²
Turtle Lake Homesite (Polson)	Some N, some Y
Schley Homesite (Evaro)	N
Alexander Lane (Elmo)	N
Dog Lake Road (Hot Springs)	N
Arlee Homesite, including the Arlee pedestrian pathway	Y
Elmo Homesite	Y
Dayton Homesite	Y
Pablo Homesite (Pablo)	Y
Clarice Paul Homesite (Ronan)	Y
Woodcock Homesite (Ronan)	Y
Salish Homesite (St. Ignatius)	Y
Mission Dam Homesite (St. Ignatius)	Y
Pache Homesite (Ronan)	Y
Park Addition Homesite (Ronan)	Y
Willow Wynn Homesite (Pablo)	Y

¹Curb and gutter affects the presence (or not) of sand after sweeping in the spring. That is, where curb and gutter is present, sand is captured and not side-cast to the adjacent slope.

²Sand may be pushed off to the side slope in streets without curb and gutter. This could affect water quality.

Table 8. Homesite and road routes, adjacent waterways, and fish or other species of interest present, Flathead Indian Reservation, 2005.

BIA ROUTE	ROUTE NAME¹	WATERWAY²	FISH SPECIES PRESENT³
¹ Some routes (e.g., Timberlane Road, Chief Martin Charlo Homesites) are within the CEAA and not included in the project area of this proposal.			
² Waterways are located in the vicinity of the routes, but are not necessarily adjacent and are not necessarily influenced by the route.			
³ Waterways with Bull Trout (BT) or West Slope Cutthroat Trout (WSCT) are arranged at the beginning of the table.			
Fisheries Management Program would be contacted when maintenance occurred at the first 20 routes listed.			
2	Dixon Agency	Flathead River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
112	Seepay Truck Trail	Seepay Creek	WSCT , SS, TAILED FROG
114	Morigeau Gulch	Hot Springs Creek	WSCT , SS
115	Vanderburg Truck Trail	Vanderburg/Seepay Creeks, Flathead River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
126	McDonald Lake	McDonald Lake	BT , WSCT , RB, LSS
127	Mill Pocket	Mill Pocket Creek	EB, WSCT , SS
10	Salish Homesite	Mission/Sabine Creek	BT , CT, RB, EB, SS, LNS, LSS, LND
130	Magpie Truck Trail	Magpie Creek	WSCT , SS, TAILED FROG
132	Garden Creek		WSCT , TAILED FROG
145	Pistol Creek Ridge	Jocko River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, LWF, PMF
146	Houle Road	Jocko River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, LWF, PMF
150	Camas East	Camas Creek	WSCT , RB
166	Revais Creek	Revais Creek, West/Middle/East Fork	WSCT , EB, SS, TAILED FROG
188	Boulder Loop Road	Yellow Bay/Blue Bay, Teepee/Talking Water/Boulder/Station Creeks	BT , WSCT , EB
1012	Jocko Prairie Road	Power Creek/St. Mary's & Twin lakes/North Fork Jocko River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, PMF
1015	Jocko Lakes Road	Jocko River: Lower &	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND,

*Proposed Road Maintenance
At Designated Homesite Systems, Road Segments, and Bridges,
Tribal Roads Program
Environmental Assessment Checklist*

		Upper Jocko Lakes	SS, MWF, PMF
1114	Pistol Creek Road	Pistol Creek/Jocko River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, PMF
123	Valley Creek Road	Valley/North/East Fork Valley Creeks	CT, RB, EB, LL, SS, LNS Western Pearl Mussels (clams), important connectivity
125	North Crow Creek Road	North Crow Creek	CT, EB, SS, LSS, LNS, RSS, WSCT
1021	Mill Creek Road	Basso Creek, Little Bitterroot River, Intermittent Streams	EB, RB, CT, RSS, LND, SS, WSCT, clams
1281	Bassoo Ridge	Bassoo Creek	EB, CT, clams

End of routes where Fisheries Management Program would be notified prior to maintenance activities.

3	Arlee Homesite	Jocko River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, LWF, PMF
4	Elmo Homesite	Flathead Lake	BT , EB, RB, CT, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
8	Clarice Paul Homesite	Crow Creek, FAID Canal	CT, EB, RB, BT , SS
12	Mission Dam Homesite	Mission Creek/FAID Canal	BT , CT, RB, EB, SS, LNS, LSS, LND
5	Dayton Creek	Dayton Creek	RB, EB, CT, LNS, LSS, YP, SS, MWF, SS
17	Alexander Lane	Flathead Lake	BT , EB, RB, CT, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
299	Timberlane Road	Crow Creek, FAID Canal	CT, EB, RB, BT , SS
301	Sunny Slope Road	Flathead Lake	BT , EB, RB, CT, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
400	Chief Martin Charlo Homesite	Jocko River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, LWF, PMF
402	Beckwith Lots	Mission Creek	BT , CT, RB, EB, SS, LNS, LSS, LND
403	South Valley Creek Homesites	Jocko River	BT , EB, RB, CT, LL, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, LWF, PMF
404	Nancy Joseph Homesites	Flathead Lake	BT , EB, RB, CT, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
405	Big Arm Townsite	Flathead Lake	BT , EB, RB, CT, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
406	Mission Creek Ranch Homesite	Mission Creek	BT , CT, RB, EB, SS, LNS, LSS, LND

*Proposed Road Maintenance
At Designated Homesite Systems, Road Segments, and Bridges,
Tribal Roads Program
Environmental Assessment Checklist*

408	South Valley Creek Road Guardrail	Jocko River	BT, EB, RB, CT, LL, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, SS, MWF, LWF, PMF
409	Elmo East	Flathead Lake	BT, EB, RB, CT, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
415	Ktunaxa Homesite	Flathead Lake	BT, EB, RB, CT, LT, LMB, SMB, NP, NPM, LNS, LSS, RSS, LND, BBH, PS, SS, YP, PM, MWF, LWF, Both species native/non-native cray fish
6	Turtle Lake Homesite	Turtle Lake, Lost Creek, FAID Canal	CT, RB, LMB, YP
7	Pablo Homesite		
9	Woodcock Homesite		
13	Schley Homesite		
14	Pache Homesite		
15	Park Addition Homesite	Ronan Spring Creek	EB, RB, LSS, LNS, LND, RSS, MWF, SS
16	Willow Wynn Homesite		
116	Welcome Springs		
122	Elmo Truck Trail	Cromwell Creek	RSS
133	McGinnis Truck Trail	Intermittent Streams	
134	Camas West	Dog Lake	NP, YP, BBH, RB
142	Camas South		
157	Selow Creek	Intermittent Streams	
164	Clear Creek	Clear Creek	RSS
165	Irvine Flats		
186	Rainbow Lake	Dog Lake, Intermittent Streams	NP, YP, PS, BBH, RB
202	Divide Road		
215	Claus Mine		
217	Saddle Mountain Road	Intermittent Streams	
300-186	Dog Lake Road	Dog Lake	NP, YP, BBH, RB, PS
401	Hughes Road	Mud Creek	RB, EB
407	Mountain View Homesite		
410	Pablo Streets	Mud Creek	RB, EB
411	College Streets	Mud Creek	RB, EB
412	Mollman Pass Trail	Kicking Horse Reservoir, Mollman Creek, FAID Canal	RB, EB
413	Maggie Ashley Court		
414	South Arlee Homesite		
416	Ronan Streets	Ronan Spring Creek	EB, RB, LSS, LNS, LND, RSS, MWF, SS

Proposed Road Maintenance
At Designated Homesite Systems, Road Segments, and Bridges,
Tribal Roads Program
Environmental Assessment Checklist

417	Terrace Lake Road	Ronan Spring Creek, North Middle Crow Creek	EB, RB, LSS, LNS, LND, RSS, MWF, SS
418	Hot Springs Homesites	Hot Springs Creek	Goes dry
1023	Mill Pocket West		
1200	Big Draw	Intermittent Streams	
1282	North Clear Creek Road		
1885	Station Creek Road	Station Creek	No fish
2150	Upper Dry Fork Road	Intermittent Streams	

Table 9. Fish species names and abbreviations

Abbreviation	Common Name	Scientific Name	Native/Non-Native
NP	Northern Pike	<i>Esox lucius</i>	Non-Native
LSS	Largescale Sucker	<i>Catostomus macrocheilus</i>	Native
LNS	Longnose Sucker	<i>Catostomus catostomas</i>	Native
NPM	Northern Pike Minnow	<i>Ptychocheilus orgonensis</i>	Native
PM	Peamouth	<i>Mylocheilus caurinus</i>	Native
RSS	Redside Shiner	<i>Richardsonius balteatus</i>	Native
LND	Longnose Dace	<i>Rhinichthys cataractae</i>	Native
KOK	Kokanee	<i>Onchorhynchus nerka</i>	Non-Native
RB	Rainbow Trout	<i>Onchorhynchus mykiss</i>	Non-Native
WSCT	Westslope Cutthroat Trout	<i>Onchorhynchus clarki lewisi</i>	Native
CT	Cutthroat Trout/Possible RB Hybrid	<i>mykiss X clarki lewisi</i>	Non-Native
YSCT	Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout	<i>Onchorhynchus clarki bouvieri</i>	Non-Native
LL	Brown Trout	<i>Salmo trutta</i>	Non-Native
EB	Eastern Brook Trout	<i>Salvelinus fontinalis</i>	Non-Native
BT	Bull Trout	<i>Salvelinus confluentus</i>	Native
LT	Lake Trout	<i>Salvelinus namaycush</i>	Non-Native
MWF	Mountain Whitefish	<i>Prosopium williamsoni</i>	Native
PWF	Pigmy Whitefish	<i>Prosopium coulteri</i>	Native
LWF	Lake Whitefish	<i>Coregonus clupeaformis</i>	Non-Native
BBH	Black Bullhead	<i>Ameiurus melas</i>	Non-Native
YBH	Yellow Bullhead	<i>Ameiurus natalis</i>	Non-Native
MF	Mosquitofish	<i>Gambusia affinis</i>	Non-Native
PS	Pumpkinseed	<i>Lepomis gibbosus</i>	Non-Native
LMB	Largemouth Bass	<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>	Non-Native
SMB	Smallmouth Bass	<i>Micropterus dolomieu</i>	Non-Native
SS	Slimy Sculpin	<i>Cottus cognatus</i>	Native
YP	Yellow Perch	<i>Perca flavescens</i>	Non-Native

Correspondence from Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) Staff

Shoreline Protection Office

-----Original Message-----

From: Daniel Lipscomb [mailto:danl@cskt.org]

Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2005 8:40 AM

To: rosel@cskt.org

Subject: RE: Potential IDT for a road maintenance EA

Rose, we can address culvert replacement as needed. If there are several within a road, then one application can cover them all. If the proposal is for scattered culverts, then each one would need to be permitted separately.

Wildlife Management Program, comments relative to Bald Eagles

From: Brett Gullett [brettg@cskt.org], Wildlife Management Program

Sent: Friday, October 21, 2005 8:20 AM

To: rosel@cskt.org

Rose,

The **Dixon/Agency** homesites are on the other side of the river from the eagle nests. That pair has been highly variable in placement of nest over the years. One nest site is out of the ½-mile radius from the homesites, and 1 is inside this radius. In this situation, maintenance operations may blend in with the disturbances already found in association with the homesites.

Summary: Go ahead with planned maintenance in this area.

The **Upper Lonepine** nest is in between two main forest roads (although neither are included in this proposal). Road **2150** is at the outside edge of a ½ mile buffer around this nest site. This nest has been erratic in production in recent years.

Mitigation Measures for the Upper Lonepine site:

- **Control disturbance** between **Feb. 1-Aug. 15**.
- It is possible to conduct maintenance operations if the wildlife program is contacted prior to work and the pair is inactive.
- The **earliest time** for this (to conduct work) would be is approximately **mid-May**.

Wildlife Management Program, comments relative to other species of interest

Initial concerns:

- Effect of the proposed action on Threatened & Endangered Species.
- Effect on other wildlife species

Affected Environment

The scope of this plan encompasses most of the ecosystems and fire regimes found on the Flathead Indian Reservation. The lower elevation ecosystems, dominated by grasslands and/or a mix of Ponderosa pine and Douglas fir make up the non-lethal fire regime. The mid-elevation ecosystems, with a mixture of Douglas fir and western larch make up the mixed fire regime. The higher elevation stands, dominated by lodgepole pine and subalpine fir lies in the lethal fire regime. As could be expected from the diverse ecosystems represented, the wildlife species also are highly variable. For a complete description of the resources of this area, refer to the *Flathead Indian Reservation Forest Management Plan, 2000 (CSKT 2000)*

Mitigation Measures

In Grizzly Bear Habitat (Figure 4 and Figures 5-1 through 5-3):

- Conduct proposed activity during the summer (June 15 to Sept. 15).
- Store food and garbage in bear-proof containers and remove from the site daily.
- No firearms allowed on the job site.
- Immediately report sightings of grizzly bears or bear sign to the CS&KT Wildlife Management Program or CS&KT Fish & Game.

Effects of Implementation

The roads, homesites, and bridges have already been built. The effects from building have already occurred.

The effects of the proposed maintenance on wildlife species will be limited to disturbance during the time of implementation. These effects will be of relatively short duration (less than a few days to a week in any one location) and may cause the larger wildlife species a temporary and minor disruption of their daily movement patterns.

Summary of Effects

- With mitigation measures in place, there would be low-level and localized effects to wildlife in the immediate vicinity.
- There would be **no measurable direct, indirect, or cumulative effects** to important wildlife habitats or to wildlife populations from the proposal, with mitigation measures and design features in place (**Section 2.0**).

G. Barce, Wildlife Management Program, 29 Sept. 2005

Information from the Fisheries Management Program

From: Barry Hansen [barryh@cskt.org]

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2005 11:56 AM

To: Rose Leach

Subject: FW: Potential IDT for a road maintenance EA

As far as site specifics, I think it would be best if we just listed the revised BMPs for road maintenance (**Section 2.0**) that would apply to all activities. My concerns are primarily with forest roads and stream crossings. Barry

Information from CSKT Hydro Geologist, Seth Makepeace, October 14, 2005

Overall

The primary water resource concerns are related to work on the forest road network. The majority of mitigation measures are identified in the CSKT Forestry Best Management Practices handbook.

Snowplowing

The only identified concern with snowplowing is that melting at snow stockpile areas can introduce sediment and road oils into water bodies. One appropriate mitigation for this would be to locate snow stockpiles away from (1) open waterbodies, and (2) open sewer grates, manholes, or other features that will route melting snow into a stormwater collection system.

Roadway grading and blading

Roadway grading and blading is one of the most common activities that lead to chronic discharge of road bed sediments into stream channels. This occurs via one of three mechanisms.

- material is directly sidecast into streams or areas immediately adjacent to streams;
- material is windrowed into a berm which subsequently erodes into a streamside area; and
- material is windrowed into a berm, and the presence of the berm prevents road runoff from leaving the road surface. Runoff volume generally increases in magnitude and entrained sediment, and may eventually discharge to a stream area.

❖ All three of these conditions are addressed in the CSKT BMPs for forest roads, but compliance with these recommendations is not complete.

Appropriate mitigation would include the following.

1. Insure that contractors read and understand the BMPs, and insure that BMPs are adhered to.
2. For any roadway area located within 50 feet of a stream, do not sidecast road material or locate road material in a berm along the road. If necessary, outhaul material with a backhoe or other equipment.

Culvert rehabilitation and installation

The roads program installs cross drain culverts on the main road network, and much less frequently stream crossing culverts. Both activities are clearly addressed in the CSKT forest practices BMPs. Adherence to the BMPs, and compliance with ALCO permitting provisions for applicable projects, should serve as suitable mitigation measures.

Sanding

Sanding concerns occur during melt periods or in the spring when snowpack is completely gone. Sand is easily mobilized and routes into open water bodies or stormwater collection systems. Community, County, and Highway road crews use power sweepers to remove sand as a water quality BMP, but also to prevent clogging in stormwater collection systems. I am not aware of the magnitude of road sanding completed by the Tribes, but if warranted the program should remove sand in the early spring.

Surface overlay and chip-seal

I do not have concerns with this activity, based on the assumption that petroleum products will be handled appropriately.

Right-of-way clearing

The only issue I can identify here is when rights of way are located through wetland areas. In these instances, clearing should be minimized.

Sign maintenance

No issue

Bridge maintenance and repair

I do not identify any issues with minor bridge repair. Larger projects may require an ALCO permit, in which case the applicant should adhere to the stipulations of the permit.

Weed spraying

I do not identify issues with weed spraying, as long as the spray is applied following label restrictions for the relevant product.

List of Figures

- Figure 1. Watersheds, Homesites, and Roads Maintained by MDT, Flathead Indian Reservation
- Figure 2. BIA Bridges by Watershed, Flathead Indian Reservation
- Figure 3. BIA Roads by Watershed, Flathead Indian Reservation
- Figure 4. BIA Roads, Eagle and Osprey Nests, and Grizzly Bear Habitat
- Figure 5-1. BIA Roads, Bridges, and Homesites in Grizzly Bear Habitat—North East Area
- Figure 5-2. BIA Roads, Bridges, and Homesites in Grizzly Bear Habitat—East Central Area
- Figure 5-3. BIA Roads, Bridges, and Homesites in Grizzly Bear Habitat—South East Area
- Figure 6. Cumulative Effects Analysis Area, BIA Roads

Bridge Figures

- B-1. BIA Bridges and Roads in the Little Bitterroot Watershed
- B-2. BIA Bridges and Roads in the Jocko and the Southwest Watersheds
- B-3. Dry Creek Bridge
- B-4. Hicks Creek Bridge
- B-5. Middle and North Fork Jocko River Bridges
- B-6. Mill Creek and Mill Pocket Bridges
- B-7. South Valley Creek Bridge
- B-8. West Magpie Creek Bridge
- B-9. Revais Creek Bridges (3)

Homesite Figures

- H-1. Dixon Homesite (Flathead River Watershed)
- H-2. Arlee & Schley, Jocko Watershed
- H-3. Flathead Lake Watershed (Dayton Creek, Elmo and Alexander Lane)
- H-4. Turtle Lake, Flathead Lake Watershed
- H-5. Crow Watershed (Willow Wynn, Pablo, Park, Pache, Clarice Paul, and Woodcock)
- H-6. Mission Watershed (Salish Addition, Mission Dam)
- H-7. Dog Lake (Camas Watershed)

Road Figures

- R-1 through R-37 (see **Table 4** for the list of Road Names)

Watershed Figures

- W-1. BIA Roads in the Camas Watershed
- W-2. BIA Roads in the Crow Watershed
- W-3. BIA Roads in the Flathead Lake Watershed
- W-4. BIA Roads in the Flathead River Watershed
- W-5. BIA Roads in the Mission Watershed

See **Figure B-1** for BIA Roads in the Little Bitterroot Watershed

See **Figure B-2** for BIA Roads in the Jocko and the Southwest Watersheds