

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 RIGHT PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 76LJ-P109433
2. **Applicant/Contact name and address:**  
John D. & Sharon C. Snell  
228 Cayuse Lane  
Kalispell, MT 59901
3. **Water source name:** GROUNDWATER WELL
4. **Location affected by action:** NWNENE, SECTION 34, T35N, R21W, FLATHEAD 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. THIS APPLICATION IS TO OBTAIN THE LEGAL RIGHT OT USE THE WATER IN A WELL. THIS WELL WAS DRILLED ON THE OWNERS PROPERTY USING STANDARD WELL DRILLING PRACTICES WITH MINIMAL DISTURBANCE TO THE AREA. WELLS DRILLED IN THIS MANNER HAVE LITTLE TO NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT. THIS EA CHECKLIST WILL ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURAL IMPACTS TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE POINT OF DIVERSION. WATER WILL BE DIVERTED YEAR ROUND AT A RATE OF 20 GPM NOT TO EXCEED 1.63 ACRE-FEET PER YEAR. THE WELL IS LOCATED IN THE GLACIER COMPACT AREA.
6. **Agencies consulted during preparation of the environmental assessment:**  
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE (SHPO)  
NATURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM (NHP)

**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, A QUERY FROM SHPO RESULTED IN NO KNOWN ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES IN THE PROPOSED LOCATION.

**Erosion:**

Alteration of erosion or siltation patterns that modify streambeds or lake shores?

NO, THE APPLICATION IS FOR A WELL. THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY DOES NOT BORDER A LAKE OF STREAM.

**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. A QUERY WITH NHP RESULTED IN TWO PLANT SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN. HOWEVER, THE LISTED PLANTS ARE MORE THAN ONE MILE FROM THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY. THE PROPOSED USE WILL NOT ADVERSELY EFFECT VEGETATION.

**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, turbidity, quantity, or distribution?

THERE WILL BE SLIGHT ALTERATION OF GROUNDWATER QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION ASSOCIATED TO DOMESTIC WELL USE. THE FLOW RATE AND VOLUME ARE SMALL ENOUGH THAT THEY SHOULD NOT IMPACT THE WATER AVAILABLE IN THE AQUIFER.

**Floodplain:**

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

NO IMPACT

**Wildlife Habitat/Migration:**

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

ALTHOUGH THERE MAY BE WILDLIFE THAT TRAVELS ACROSS THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY, THE PROPOSED USE OF WATER WILL NOT EFFECT WILDLIFE HABITAT OR MIGRATION.

**Endangered Species:**

Adverse effects on any unique or endangered species?

A QUERY WITH THE NHP RESULTED IN THREE ANIMAL SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN. THE THREE SPECIES ARE THE GRIZZLY BEAR, THE WESTSLOPE CUTTHROAT TROUT, AND THE COMMON LOON. THE SPECIES INDICATED ARE TWO PLUS MILES FROM THE PROPOSED POINT OF DIVERSION. THE PROPOSED WATER USE WILL NOT ADVERSELY EFFECT ENDANGERED SPECIES.

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

**Existing Land Use:**

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

THE WELL AND HOME HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR THE PAST 20 YEARS. ISSUING THIS WATER RIGHT WILL INCREASE THE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY.

**Historical Significance:**

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

NO, THERE ARE NO KNOWN SITES OF HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE IN THIS AREA ACCORDING TO SHPO.

**Populace:**

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

NO, THE HOME AND WELL HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

**Transportation:**

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

NO, THE HOME AND WELL HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

**Safety:**

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

NO, THE HOME AND WELL HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

**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, THE HOME AND WELL HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

**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, THE HOME AND WELL HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

**Aesthetics:**

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

NO, THE HOME AND WELL HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

**Other:**

THE HOME AND WELL HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS. THEREFORE, MAKING THE USE OF WATER LEGAL WILL NOT HAVE ANY ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE PHYSICAL OR HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.

THE APPLICANT WILL BE INFORMED OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY NHP. SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN WERE IDENTIFIED IN THE VICINITY OF THIS PROJECT BUT WERE NOT IN THE DIRECT LOCATION.

- 
2. **Secondary and cumulative impacts:** NONE
3. **Reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the no action alternative:**  
1) ISSUE THE PERMIT, THERE IS A NET LONG TERM POSITIVE IMPACT TO THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT AND NO IMPACT TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.  
2) REJECT THE APPLICATION DUE TO UNKNOWN CUMULATIVE IMPACTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT. THE APPLICANT WILL NOT HAVE A LEGAL RIGHT TO THEIR EXISTING WELL.

### **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:

AN EA IS ADEQUATE FOR THIS ACTION. NO ADVERSE IMPACTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED; THEREFORE, AN EIS IS NOT REQUIRED.

PREPARED BY:

NAME: CRISTY CARTER  
TITLE: WATER RESOURCES SPECIALIST  
DATE: [Automatic date code removed]