

EA #:

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

Name and address of applicant: Randy Moret
3121 Spain Bridge Road
Belgrade, MT 59714

Has the pond been approved for a private pond permit in the past? No.

Location:

County: Gallatin Township: 2N Range: 4E Section: 15

Name of the drainage where the pond would be located: Dry Creek Drainage, East Gallatin River

Name(s) of fish species proposed for introduction: Rainbow trout

Is this species native to the drainage? If not, was it introduced legally (i.e. by a fish management agency)? Not native to the drainage. Introduced to the drainage legally. Pond is not in or near an active drainage.

List species of special concern present in the drainage: None

RISKS:

Inlets to or outlets from the pond? Yes___ No X

Explain: Pond has no inlet or outlet.

Potential for impacts on genetic structure of wild fish populations?

None___ Minor X Major___

Comments required for minor or major impacts: There is only a very low risk of fish escaping this pond to an otherwise fishless and normally dry drainage below. No risks to wild fish.

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

None X Minor___ Major___

Comments required for minor or major impacts:

Impacts to other forms of aquatic life that may be caused by this introduction?

None X Minor___ Major___

Comments required for minor or major impacts:

Potential for the proposed new species to reproduce in this location?

None___ Minor X Major___

Comments required for minor or major impacts: Very low likelihood that trout can reproduce successfully in this pond.

If necessary, would it be feasible to remove this species after it has been stocked? How?
Yes. Pond could be drained and remaining fish removed using several combinations of chemical or physical means.

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).

No action would result in pond owner not receiving a license to stock trout. There are no compelling ecological or pond safety reasons not to allow this stocking to occur.

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

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

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

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

This EA checklist is sufficient to identify and address all appropriate physical and ecological concerns. No major issues are identified that would require further analysis. An EIS is therefore unnecessary.

Literature Cited: N/A

EA prepared by: Joel Tohtz, FWP Fisheries Biologist

Comments will be accepted until: N/A

Comments should be sent to: Bruce Rich
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks
1400 South 19th Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59718

APPENDIX A

PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT CHECKLIST

The 54th Legislature enacted the Private Property Assessment Act, Chapter 462, Laws of Montana (1995). The intent of the legislation is to establish an orderly and consistent process by which state agencies evaluate their proposed actions under the "Takings Clauses" of the United States and Montana Constitutions. The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution provides: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Similarly, Article II, Section 29 of the Montana Constitution provides: "Private property shall not be taken or damaged for public use without just compensation..."

The Private Property Assessment Act applies to proposed agency actions pertaining to land or water management or to some other environmental matter that, if adopted and enforced without compensation, would constitute a deprivation of private property in violation of the United States or Montana Constitutions.

The Montana State Attorney General's Office has developed guidelines for use by state agency to assess the impact of a proposed agency action on private property. The assessment process includes a careful review of all issues identified in the Attorney General's guidance document (Montana Department of Justice 1997). If the use of the guidelines and checklist indicates that a proposed agency action has taking or damaging implications, the agency must prepare an impact assessment in accordance with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act. For the purposes of this EA, the questions on the following checklist refer to the following required stipulation(s):

(List any mitigation/stipulations required, or note "None".)

DOES THE PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION HAVE TAKINGS IMPLICATIONS

UNDER THE PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT?

YES

NO

- | | | |
|-------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | 1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights? |
| _____ | _____ | 2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property? |
| _____ | _____ | 3. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property? |
| _____ | _____ | 4. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? |
| _____ | _____ | 5. Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? [If the answer is NO , skip questions 5a and 5b and continue with question 6.] |
| _____ | _____ | 5a. Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interests? |
| _____ | _____ | 5b. Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property? |
| _____ | _____ | 6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property? |
| _____ | _____ | 7. Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public generally? [If the answer is NO , do not answer questions 7a-7c.] |
| _____ | _____ | 7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant? |
| _____ | _____ | 7b. Has government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded? |
| _____ | _____ | 7c. Has government action diminished property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question? |

Taking or damaging implications exist if **YES** is checked in response to question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if **NO** is checked in response to questions 5a or 5b.

If taking or damaging implications exist, the agency must comply with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act, to include the preparation of a taking or damaging impact assessment. Normally, the preparation of an impact assessment will require consultation with agency legal staff.