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. 76F-107987

2. **Applicant/Contact name and address:** Claud Reinoehl
Box 19
Greenough MT 59836-0019

3. **Water source name:** UT of North Fork of the Blackfoot River

4. **Location affected by action:** NESWSE Sec 32, T15N, R11W

5. **Narrative summary of the proposed project and action to be taken:** A stock water pit about six (6) feet deep will be dug in the stream channel. At times when water flows in the stream it will collect in the pit for use by cattle.

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?

None

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

Only for a few hours during construction, if the stream is flowing

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?

See *Erosion* section above

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

None, the storage is too small for these changes to occur

Wildlife Habitat/Migration:
Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat? Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of fish or wildlife?

None

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?

Insignificant

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

None

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?

None

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?

None

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

None

Other:

None

---

2. Secondary and cumulative impacts: None

3. Reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the no action alternative:

A. Drilling a well for stock water supply. This would require electrical service to the well, an automated engine driven pump, or a wind mill. A well would allow greater, or more flexible periods of grazing in the pasture.

B. Hauling water requires a truck or pickup and a tank as well as frequent visits to the pasture.

C. No action would be less expensive in terms of water development, but would limit the use of the pasture to times when there is surface water flow.

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 proposed development is small and its affect on the environment will only be short term and will be in the immediate area of the development.

PREPARED BY:

NAME: Jim Beck
TITLE: Ag Specialist
DATE: [Automatic date code removed]