

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
For Routine Actions with Limited Environmental Impact

Part I. Proposed Action Description

1. Applicant/Contact name and address: Roosevelt County Conservation District
PO Box 517
Culbertson, MT 59218
2. Type of action: Application to Change a Water Right No. 40S-30045035
3. Water source name: Missouri River
4. Location affected by project: SWNWNE, Section 6, T27N, R56E, Roosevelt County
5. Narrative summary of the proposed project, purpose, action to be taken, and benefits:
This change application is to use a portion of the Roosevelt County Conservation District's water reservation. The project will use 800 gpm up to 176.9 acre-feet on a total of 73 acres. The point of diversion is located in the SWNWNE, Section 6, T27N, R56E. The place of use is 67 acres in the E2E2 of Section 36, T28N, R55E and 6 acres in the W2W2W2 of Section 31, T28N, R56E, Roosevelt County. The applicant will benefit from this project by developing a portion of their water reservation that was granted in 1994. The producer will benefit by having an additional 73 acres under sprinkler irrigation. This project will be to add a center pivot to an existing point of diversion and pipeline.

The DNRC shall issue a change authorization if an applicant proves the criteria in 85-2-402 MCA are met.

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

Montana Natural Heritage Program
Roosevelt County Soil Survey – Web Soil Survey
Montana Department of Environmental Quality – Website
National Wetlands Inventory – Website
Lower Missouri River Basin Final EIS
MT Dept of Fish, Wildlife & Parks (Montana Rivers Information System) – Website

Part II. Environmental Review

1. Environmental Impact Checklist:

<h2>PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</h2>

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: The Missouri River is not identified as a chronically or periodically dewatered stream by the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks. The DFWP has a water reservation on this portion of the Missouri River for 5178 cfs to maintain instream flows.

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: The Montana Department of Environmental Quality has listed this segment of the Missouri River on the TMDL 303(d) list. The listing shows partial support for aquatic life and warm water fish. The probable reason for the partial support of these uses is flow regulation/modification due to Fort Peck Dam. All other uses are fully supported by the source. The authorization of this project will have no significant impact on water quality.

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: The use of this surface water should have no impact on groundwater supply or quality.

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: The diversion consists of an existing Cornell 4RB-40 pump mounted on an Ames FPS 1240 portable flotation system. The pump is currently used to irrigate an existing system. Water will be pumped into an existing pipeline to an existing center pivot. The 10 inch pipeline will be extended from the existing pivot to the proposed new center pivot. As this project will be using an existing pump site, no channel impacts, flow modifications or barriers will occur as a result of authorization of this application to change.

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: A report received from the Montana Natural Heritage Program indicates there are seven species of special concern within the general area of the project. Three of these species are currently listed under the Endangered Species Act. The least tern and the pallid sturgeon are listed as endangered and the piping plover as threatened. The sicklefin chub and the sturgeon chub are candidates for listing. The paddlefish and the blue sucker are classified as special status by the Bureau of Land Management. Habitat for all these species extends over numerous townships.

The least tern and the piping plover prefer nesting sites on barren islands and sandbars. Pump sites are typically set in deeper water. The shallow water around islands and sandbars are avoided. There is a sandbar near the proposed pump site, on the opposite side of the river, however this project will be using an existing pump site so no additional impact to the tern or plover should occur.

Impacts to wildlife from the development of the McCone County Conservation District’s water reservation were addressed in the Lower Missouri River Basin Final Environmental Impact Statement prior to the granting of the reservations.

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: According to the National Wetland Inventory there is a palustrine wetland just to the southeast of the location of the proposed pivot. This wetland is an old oxbow of the Missouri River, is located on the state land portion of this project, and is not located on any of the acres to be irrigated. The only other wetland near the proposed project is the Missouri River itself.

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

Determination: Not applicable. This is a pump diversion out of the Missouri River.

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: According to the Roosevelt County Soil Survey, the predominant soil types under the proposed project are Lohler silty clay and Haverlon silt loam. These soil types are moderately to well drained, nearly level soils found on flood plains and formed in alluvium. Permeability is slow to moderate and the available water capacity is high. Runoff is slow and the hazard of water erosion is slight. The hazard of erosion from blowing is moderate. These soil types are used for both dryland and irrigated crops and are not prone to saline seep.

Irrigation enhances crop cover during the growing season and provides more protection from wind and water erosion. Irrigation also increases plant residues returned to the soil. Soil

structure is improved, microbe populations benefit from the added food source, and nitrogen fertility is enhanced.

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: The land is currently farmed but not irrigated. The extension of the pipeline will cross a currently irrigated field with a temporary disturbance to the crop cover. There will be no additional impacts to the existing vegetative cover as a result of this application. It is the responsibility of the property owner to control noxious weeds on their property.

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 to air quality are expected due to this project.

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

Determination: The Montana State Historic Preservation Office was not consulted regarding this project. The project is currently farmland and will use an existing pump site. There will be no additional ground disturbing activities other than constructing an extension to the pipeline across a currently farmed field. As these acres are currently farmed any ground disturbing activities have already taken place. Additionally, as the project is located on private property, any cultural resource inventory conducted would be at the property owner's discretion.

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 to other environmental resources were 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: There are no known environmental plans or goals in this area.

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: This project will have no significant impact on recreational or wilderness activities.

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

Determination: This change application will have no impact on human health.

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: There are no additional government regulatory impacts on private property rights associated with this application.

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

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

Secondary Impacts – No secondary impacts have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts – Cumulative impacts were addressed in the Lower Missouri River Basin Final Environmental Impact Statement, 1994, granting the water reservations to the conservation districts.

3. **Describe any mitigation/stipulation measures:** None 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:** Under the no action alternative the Roosevelt County Conservation District could not allocate this portion of their water reservation to the property owner. To continue to fulfill the purpose for which the water reservation was granted, the Conservation District could authorize this portion of water to another individual.

PART III. Conclusion

1. **Preferred Alternative:** Issue a change authorization if the applicant proves the criteria in 85-2-402, MCA are met.

2 **Comments and Responses**

3. **Finding:**
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: No significant impacts have been identified, therefore an EIS is not necessary.

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

Name: Denise Biggar
Title: Glasgow Unit Manager
Date: April 17, 2009