

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. 76GJ-105507
2. **Applicant/Contact name and address:** JACK M SCANLON
1606 HARRIS CT
HELENA, MT 59601-5405
3. **Water source name:** GROUND WATER WELL
4. **Location affected by action:** NESWNE of Sec. 09, TWP05N, RGE13W
5. **Narrative summary of the proposed project and action to be taken:** The proposed project is to supply water to a 13 lot Subdivision. The well is located in the NESWNE of Sec. 9, Twp 5N, Rge 13W, Deer Lodge County.
6. **Agencies consulted during preparation of the environmental assessment:** None

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?

All of the houses and the well are already developed, so there will not be any additional degradation to the soils.

Erosion:

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

None

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?

None

Air:

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

None

Water:

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

None

Floodplain:

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

None

Wildlife Habitat/Migration:

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

Because the houses and the well are already developed there will not be any additional deterioration of wildlife habitat. Initially when the houses when first developed they probably did create a barrier to migration of wildlife.

Endangered Species:

Adverse effects on any unique or endangered species?

None

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Existing Land Use:

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

None

Historical Significance:

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

None known

Populace:

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

None

Transportation:

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

None

Safety:

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

None

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?

When the houses were initially constructed, there would have been an increased need for public services. However, most of the houses have been there for several years and the public services that were needed have already been established.

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?

Most of the utilities have already been installed and are being used.

Aesthetics:

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

None known.

Other: None

2. Secondary and cumulative impacts: None

3. Reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the no action alternative: The subdivision and the well are already developed. Any impacts to the environment or the surroundings have already occurred. The Department could deny the permit application which would mean the houses would have to go without water. The subdivision was using another well for several years, but had problems with it so they drilled a new one.

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:

The well and the houses are already in place and are probably using the well--any affects to the surroundings or the environment would have already been recognized.

PREPARED BY:

NAME: JENNY O'MARA
TITLE: WATER RESOURCES SPECIALIST
DATE: