

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION
WATER RESOURCES DIVISION
WATER RIGHTS BUREAU
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

1. **Type of action:** Water use permit application no. 41P-098649-00
Water right change application no.
Petition or Other Action:
2. **Applicant/Contact name and address:** New Miami Colony, RT 3 Box 448,
Conrad, MT 59425
3. **Water source name:** Groundwater well
4. **Location affected by action:** NESWSW Sec. 8, TWP 28N, RGE 05W, Pondera
County
5. **Narrative summary of the proposed project and action to be taken:** The
DNRC shall issue a water use permit if an applicant proves the
criteria in 85-2-311, MCA, are met. The applicant is seeking a water
use permit to pump 25 gpm up to 20 acre-feet from a groundwater well.
The water will be used for the colony's domestic use of 20 families
from January 1 to December 31. The well will be manifold with their
old well which is filed on 41P-P058184. The area of use is located in
the NESWSW and SENWSW of Sec. 8, TWP 28N, RGE 05W, Pondera County.
6. **Agencies consulted during preparation of the environmental assessment:**
Department of Environmental Quality

PART II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1. Environmental Impact Checklist:

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Soils/Geologic Features:

Degradation of soil quality or alteration of soil stability, moisture
content, geologic substructure, unique geologic features, archeological
sites?

NO

Erosion:

Alteration of erosion or siltation patterns which modify stream beds or
lake shores?

NO

Vegetation/Noxious weeds:

Change in or adverse affect on diversity and production of local plant
species including any unique or endangered species (including trees,
shrubs, grass, and aquatic plants)? Establishment or spread of noxious
weeds?

NO

Air:

Deterioration of air quality, or adverse effects on vegetation due to increased air pollutants.

NO

Water:

Alteration of surface water or groundwater quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity or quantity or distribution?

Craig Pegal, DEQ, indicated that the Colony is currently under their jurisdiction for their public water supply system. The colony did not have approval by DEQ to modify their system. Mr. Pegal indicated from the information provided on their water right application, he was concerned about the quantity since the new well was only air tested. Other than that, he did not foresee any other significant environmental concerns.

Floodplain:

Changes in drainage patterns, course or magnitude of flood flows, or exposure of people/property to hazards (flood)?

NO

Wildlife Habitat/Migration:

Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat? Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of fish or wildlife?

NO

Endangered Species:

Adverse effects on any unique or endangered species?

NO

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Existing Land Use:

Alteration of or interference with the productivity or profitability of the existing land use of an area?

NO

Historical Significance:

Destruction or alteration of a natural area of scientific or educational value or prehistoric or paleontological importance?

NO

Populace:

Alteration of the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area? Alteration of social structure of community?

NO

Transportation:

Increased traffic hazards or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?

NO

Safety:

Creation of any health hazard or affect on existing emergency response or evacuation plans?

NO

Public Services:

Have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: fire or police protection, schools, parks/recreational facilities, roads or other public maintenance, water supply, sewer or septic systems, solid waste disposal, health, or other governmental services? Have an effect upon local or state tax base?

NO

Utilities:

Creates need for new or altered facilities for any of the following utilities: electric power, natural gas, other fuel supply or distribution systems, or communications?

NO

Aesthetics:

Alteration of any scenic vista or recreation opportunity or creation of an aesthetically offensive site to the public?

NO

Other:

NO

-
2. **Secondary and cumulative impacts:** None
 3. **Reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the no action alternative:** No significant impacts have been identified. If a permit is not issued, the applicant will not get the water they need for their domestic use. Their only alternative would be to haul their water or put in a larger cistern to store the water from their other well. This would allow the water to be stored for future needs when their older well does not produce enough water for the demand.

PART III. CONCLUSION

Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required? NO

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for this proposed action:

No significant impacts were identified, therefore, an EIS is not required.

PREPARED BY:

NAME: Dixie Brough
TITLE: Water Resource Specialist
DATE: April 28, 1997