

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF FISH INTRODUCTION
PRIVATE POND APPLICATION**

Name and address of applicant: Jerry Hendrickson
Box 627
Chester, MT 59522

Is approval of private pond permit application recommended? This pond has been licensed twice in the past. The first license (#4722) was issued 29 April 1969 and "trout" were authorized. A second license was issued for the same Pond on 3 April 1989 (#4-1451) and stocking of largemouth and smallmouth bass, white and black crappie, yellow perch, and bluegill was authorized. The applicant now wishes to be permitted to stock fathead minnows.

Location of pond:

County: Liberty
Legal description: T31N R5E Sec 28, NE 1/4

Name of the drainage where the pond would be located:

Pond is located on Sagebrush Coulee, about 5 miles SW of Chester, MT. Sagebrush Coulee drains, via an intermittent channel, to Cottonwood Creek, which drains intermittently to the Marias River downstream from Tiber Dam.

Does pond have legal water rights? (describe) Not known. Pond has been licensed for more than 30 years.

Fish species proposed for introduction:

Fathead minnows, in addition to trout and other species previously authorized in 1969 and 1989.

Is this species legally present in the drainage? Yes. Fathead minnows and other species authorized for the pond are common in the Marias drainage, or have been stocked in the drainage previously.

Species of Special Concern present in the drainage: None in this area.

RISKS:

Potential for impacts on genetic structure of existing fish populations: None Minor Major

Comments: No significant impacts are expected.

Impacts to any life stage of existing fish populations due to competition and/or predation?

None Minor Major

Comments: These species are already present in drainage.

Impacts to other forms of aquatic life that may be caused by this introduction? None Minor Major

Comments: Fish will consume some invertebrates in pond.

Potential for the proposed new species to reproduce in this location: None Minor Major

Comments: Fathead minnows will reproduce successfully, but are common in this area in the wild.

If necessary, would it be feasible to remove this species after it has been stocked? Yes. Pond dries up during drought years.

Would this introduction result in impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? No.

Describe reasonable and prudent alternatives to this action, if any (including no action). Do not stock.

Describe and evaluate mitigation, stipulations, or other control measures enforceable by the agency, if any.

Species restrictions.

List any other agencies or individuals that may be affected by the proposed introduction: None.

List all agencies and individuals who have been notified of this proposed introduction: None.

Based on this evaluation, is an EIS required? YES/NO? If no, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action.

No. Impacts expected to be very minor.

EA prepared by: Steve Leathe

Date: June 22, 2004