

Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation
Water Resources Division
Water Rights Bureau

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
For Routine Actions with Limited Environmental Impact

Note: Instructions to DNRC staff for preparing this EA can be found at:
http://www.dnrc.state.mt.us/eis_ea.html

Part I. Proposed Action Description

1. *Applicant/Contact name and address:*

Dan Reddick
13607 Springhill Rd
Belgrade, MT 30016019

2. *Type of action:* Application to change a water right # 30016020-41H

3. *Water source name:* Groundwater

4. *Location affected by project:* SENWSE Sec. 34, T2N, R5E, Gallatin, Co

5. *Narrative summary of the proposed project, purpose, action to be taken, and benefits:*

PROPOSED USE:

THE APPLICANT PROPOSES TO REMOVE 2.0 ACRES FROM IRRIGATION TO COMPENSATE FOR EVAPORATIVE LOSES (0.54 ACRE-FEET) IN A 4.6 ACRE-FOOT FISH POND WITH A 0.25 ACRE SURFACE AREA LOCATED IN THE SESESW, SEC. 34, T2N, R5E . THE TWO ACRES OF IRRIGATED ACREAGE WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE NORTH AREA OF THE PROPERTY IN THE E2SW SEC. 34, T2N, R5E, GALLATIN, CO. THE NEW FLOW RATE FOR THE CALIM IS PROPOSED AT 195 GPM AND A VOLUME OF 36.14 ACRE-FEET FOR 13 ACRES.

PAST USE:

THE PAST USE OF WATER HAS A PRIORITY DATE OF 10/31/1935 FOR IRRIGATION USE FROM MAY 20 THRU OCTOBER 4 WITH A CLAIMED FLOW RATE OF 336.6 GPM AND 150 ACRE-FEET ON 15 ACRES IN THE SESW SEC. 34 T2N, R5E, GALLATIN, CO. THE SOURCE IS AN UNNAMED TRIBUTARY OF NORTH COTTONWOOD CREEK. THE POINT OF DIVERSION IS LOCATED IN THE SENWSE, SEC. 34 T2N, R5E, GALLATIN, CO.

The DNRC shall authorize a change if the applicant proves that the criteria in # 85-2-402, MCA, are met.

6. *Agencies consulted during preparation of the Environmental Assessment:
(include agencies with overlapping jurisdiction)*

Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Montana State Historic Preservation Office
Montana Natural Resource Information System
Gallatin Local Water Quality District
Gallatin County Planning Office
Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks

Part II. Environmental Review

1. Environmental Impact Checklist:

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

WATER QUANTITY, QUALITY AND DISTRIBUTION

Water quantity - *Assess whether the source of supply is identified as a chronically or periodically dewatered stream by DFWP. Assess whether the proposed use will worsen the already dewatered condition.*

Determination: No Impacts identified.

Water quantity is based on a spring that the applicant's claim is sourced. Recent off season measurements indicate 44 gpm.

Water quality - *Assess whether the stream is listed as water quality impaired or threatened by DEQ, and whether the proposed project will affect water quality.*

Determination: No impacts identified.

The source is an unnamed tributary to North Cottonwood Creek. The source is not identified by DEQ as impaired.

Groundwater - *Assess if the proposed project impacts ground water quality or supply. If this is a groundwater appropriation, assess if it could impact adjacent surface water flows.*

Determination: No impacts identified

The source is a creek. During the times of low availability the diversion should attenuate itself.

DIVERSION WORKS - *Assess whether the means of diversion, construction and operation of the appropriation works of the proposed project will impact any of the following: channel impacts, flow modifications, barriers, riparian areas, dams, well construction.*

Determination: No Impacts identified

The diversion is a head gate located on an unnamed tributary of North Cottonwood Creek in the SENWSE, SEC. 34 T2N, R5E, Gallatin, Co.

UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

Endangered and threatened species - *Assess whether the proposed project will impact any threatened or endangered fish, wildlife, plants or aquatic species or any "species of special concern," or create a barrier to the migration or movement of fish or wildlife. For groundwater, assess whether the proposed project, including impacts on adjacent surface flows, would impact any threatened or endangered species or "species of special concern."*

Determination: No Impacts identified

No species of special concern have been identified in this area.

Wetlands - *Consult and assess whether the apparent wetland is a functional wetland (according to COE definitions), and whether the wetland resource would be impacted.*

Determination: No Impacts Identified

There are springs on the property that constitute a "spongy" area. The springs may or may not be considered a wetland.

Ponds - *For ponds, consult and assess whether existing wildlife, waterfowl, or fisheries resources would be impacted.*

Determination: A 4.6 acre-foot pond fed by an unnamed tributary of North Cottonwood will be created if approved. This application will compensate for evaporation loss of 0.54 acre-feet.

GEOLOGY/SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE - *Assess whether there will be degradation of soil quality, alteration of soil stability, or moisture content. Assess whether the soils are heavy in salts that could cause saline seep.*

Determination: The area is well drained and saline seep is unlikely.

VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY/NOXIOUS WEEDS - Assess impacts to existing vegetative cover. Assess whether the proposed project would result in the establishment or spread of noxious weeds.

Determination: disruption to the surface may result in the propagation of weeds.

AIR QUALITY - Assess whether there will be a deterioration of air quality or adverse effects on vegetation due to increased air pollutants.

Determination: No impacts identified.

HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES - Assess whether there will be degradation of unique archeological or historical sites in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Determination: No Impacts Identified

Shpo has been contacted and they report of a low likelihood cultural properties will be impacted.

DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AND ENERGY - Assess any other impacts on environmental resources of land, water and energy not already addressed.

Determination: No impacts have been identified.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS - Assess whether the proposed project is inconsistent with any locally adopted environmental plans and goals.

Determination: The Gallatin county planning board does not list ponds as inconsistent with plans or goals.

ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES - Assess whether the proposed project will impact access to or the quality of recreational and wilderness activities.

Determination: No impacts identified since the property is landlocked by private land.

HUMAN HEALTH - Assess whether the proposed project impacts on human health.

Determination: No impacts to human health have been identified.

PRIVATE PROPERTY - Assess whether there are any government regulatory impacts on private property rights.

Yes___ No_x__ If yes, analyze any alternatives considered that could reduce, minimize, or eliminate the regulation of private property rights.

Determination: Tthe property is on private land.

OTHER HUMAN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES - For routine actions of limited environmental impact, the following may be addressed in a checklist fashion.

Impacts on:

- (a) Cultural uniqueness and diversity? No impacts identified
- (b) Local and state tax base and tax revenues? No impacts identified
- (c) Existing land uses? No impacts identified
- (d) Quantity and distribution of employment? No impacts identified
- (e) Distribution and density of population and housing? No impacts identified
- (f) Demands for government services? No impacts identified
- (g) Industrial and commercial activity? No impacts identified
- (h) Utilities? No impacts identified
- (i) Transportation? No impacts identified
- (j) Safety? No impacts identified
- (k) Other appropriate social and economic circumstances?

2. Secondary and cumulative impacts on the physical environment and human population:

No secondary or cumulative impacts have been identified as a result of this action.

3. Describe any mitigation/stipulation measures:

No mitigation or stipulation measures other than weed control were needed at this time.

4. Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the no action alternative, if an alternative is reasonably available and prudent to consider:

No alternative other than the no action alternative was considered. If the no action alternative was taken, the project would not be allowed to be developed and the land would remain in agricultural use

PART III. Conclusion

1. Preferred Alternative

No preferred alternative has been identified

2 Comments and Responses

No comments or responses received.

3. Finding:

Yes ___ No x Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required?

An EA is adequate for this project.

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for this proposed action:

Name of person(s) responsible for preparation of EA:

Name: Porter Dassenko

Title: Water Right Specialist

Date: 2/21/2006