

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:* TOWN OF STEVENSVILLE
PO BOX 30
STEVENSVILLE, MT 59870

2. *Type of action:* APPLICATION FOR BENEFICIAL WATER USE PERMIT
76H-30043133

3. *Water source name:* GROUNDWATER

4. *Location affected by project:* NWNENE SECTION 35, T 9 N, R 20 W, RAVALLI CO.

5. *Narrative summary of the proposed project, purpose, action to be taken, and benefits:*
THIS IS AN APPLICATION FOR A WATER RIGHT PERMIT TO USE GROUNDWATER FROM A WELL FOR MUNICIPAL PURPOSES AS REQUIRED BY THE TWIN CREEKS 117-LOT SUBDIVISION. THE REQUESTED DIVERSION IS LOCATED WITHIN THE BITTERROOT RIVER BASIN CLOSURE. ALL NEW USES OF GROUNDWATER WITH A DIVERSION RATE GREATER THAN 35 GPM AND TOTAL VOLUME GREATER THAN 10 ACRE-FEET WITHIN THIS BASIN REQUIRE A FINDING THAT ANY DEPLETION TO SURFACE WATER WOULD NOT CAUSE AN ADVERSE EFFECT TO OTHER WATER USERS OR THAT A PLAN TO MITIGATE PREDICTED DEPLETIONS ACCOMPANY AN APPLICATION. §85-2-360 MCA. THIS APPLICANT IS REQUESTING TO USE GROUNDWATER FROM A WELL AT A FLOW RATE OF 300 GPM AND A TOTAL ANNUAL VOLUME FOR THE STATED PURPOSES OF 96.3 ACRE-FEET. THIS APPLICANT HAS COMPLETED A HYDROGEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT REPORT TO COMPLY WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S REQUIREMENTS FOR AQUIFER TESTING. THE APPLICANT HAS PROPOSED A PLAN TO MITIGATE PREDICTED DEPLETIONS TO THE BITTERROOT RIVER WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN APPLICATION TO CHANGE A WATER RIGHT 76H-30043132. DEPARTMENT HYDRO-GEOLOGISTS HAVE REVIEWED THE APPLICANT'S REPORT AND ACCEPTED IT AS CREDIBLE.

THE DNRC SHALL ISSUE A WATER USE PERMIT IF AN APPLICANT PROVES THE CRITERIA IN 85-2-311, MCA ARE MET.

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

STATE HISTORICAL PRESERVATION OFFICE
MONTANA NATURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM

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: SEE GROUNDWATER SECTION BELOW

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: SEE GROUNDWATER SECTION BELOW

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 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

THE PROPOSED PROJECT WELL IS LOCATED IN THE NWNENE SECTION 35, T 9 N, R 20 W. THE WELL IS 435 FEET IN DEPTH AND WOULD BE USED TO DIVERT A FLOW RATE OF 300 GPM AND A VOLUME UP TO 96.3 ACRE-FEET DURING THE YEAR-ROUND PERIOD OF USE FOR MUNICIPAL PURPOSES.

IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH THE DEPARTMENT NEW APPROPRIATIONS RULES, THE APPLICANT HAS COMPLETED AN AQUIFER TEST AND REPORTED THE RESULTS IN A HYDROGEOLOGIC ASSESSMENT. THE APPLICANT HAS PREPARED AN AQUIFER REPORT TO DEMONSTRATE THE PHYSICAL COMPONENTS OF THE AQUIFER AND DETERMINE THE PROBABLE IMPACTS TO THE AQUIFER AND OTHER DIVERSIONS WITHIN THE AQUIFER. IN THE AQUIFER REPORT, NEARBY WELLS WERE MONITORED DURING THE PUMP TEST TO DETERMINE IMPACTS TO THOSE WELLS. IMPACTS TO NEARBY WELLS WERE DETERMINED TO BE VERY MINOR. DEPLETIONS TO NEARBY SURFACE WATER SOURCES WERE CONSIDERED AND DETERMINED TO BE APPROXIMATELY 50 ACRE-FEET ANNUALLY DEPARTMENT HYDRO-GEOLOGISTS REVIEWED THE APPLICANT'S REPORT AND DETERMINED IT TO BE CREDIBLE. THE APPLICANT COMPLETED

WATER QUANTITY AND WATER QUALITY TESTING AS REQUIRED BY MTDEQ FOR PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS.

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 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

A LICENSED WELL DRILLER CONSTRUCTED THE PROPOSED PROJECT WELL TO A DEPTH OF 435 FEET. THE WELL HAS AN 10-INCH DIAMETER CASING. THE STATIC WATER LEVEL MEASURED IN THE WELL IS 137.25 FEET. A 72-HOUR PUMP TEST OF THE WELL WAS COMPLETED. THE TEST RATE WAS 1,106 GPM FOR 72-HOURS. THE APPLICANT'S REPORT INDICATES A MAXIMUM DRAWDOWN OF 231.1 FEET AFTER 28 HOURS. THE APPLICANT INDICATES THAT THE WELL BEGAN TO RECOVER IN THE FINAL 45 HOURS OF TESTING. INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT INDICATES THAT THE WELL IS CAPABLE OF MAINTAINING THE REQUESTED FLOW AND IS ADEQUATE FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

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 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

THE MONTANA NATURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM PROVIDED INFORMATION FROM ITS DATABASE REGARDING SPECIES OF CONCERN IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

THE DATA SEARCH IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING ANIMAL SPECIES: WESTSLOPE CUTTHROAT TROUT, BALD EAGLE, BARN OWL, BOBOLINK, WESTERN SPOTTED SKUNK AND GRAY WOLF.

THE DATA SEARCH IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING PLANT SPECIES: COLUMBIA WATER-MEAL AND SHINING FLAT-SEDGE

THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS NOT EXPECTED TO HAVE IMPACTS ON THE IDENTIFIED SPECIES.

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.

THERE ARE NO WETLANDS IDENTIFIED IN THE AREA OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

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

Determination: NO IMPACTS.

THERE ARE PONDS IDENTIFIED IN THE AREA OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT, HOWEVER NO IMPACTS ARE EXPECTED.

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: NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

ALTERATIONS TO SOILS WILL OCCUR AS A RESULT OF THE STAGED DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWIN CREEKS SUBDIVISION. AFTER FULL DEVELOPMENT, THE SOILS WOULD BE CONSIDERED TO CONSISTENT WITH A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

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: NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

THE PROPOSED PLACE OF USE IS BEING DEVELOPED INTO A 117-LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS NOT EXPECTED TO INCREASE THE PROBABILITY OF THE SPREAD OF NOXIOUS 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.

AIR QUALITY WOULD NOT BE IMPACTED BY THE USE OF A WELL FOR MUNICIPAL PURPOSES.

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.

THE STATE HISTORICAL PRESERVATION OFFICE RECOMMENDS THAT NO CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEYS ARE WARRANTED GIVEN THE EXTENT OF THE EXISTING GROUND DISTURBANCE.

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 NOT ALREADY DISCUSSED.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

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

Determination: NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.

THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS LOCATED WITHIN THE TOWN OF STEVENSVILLE AND WILL BE SERVED BY A COMPONENT OF THE MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY.

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.

THE PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT IMPAIR ACCESS TO RECREATIONAL OR WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.

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

Determination: NO IMPACTS.

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: NO IMPACTS.

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

Impacts on:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| (a) <u>Cultural uniqueness and diversity?</u> | NONE |
| (b) <u>Local and state tax base and tax revenues?</u> | MINOR |
| (c) <u>Existing land uses?</u> | MINOR |
| (d) <u>Quantity and distribution of employment?</u> | NONE |

- (e) Distribution and density of population and housing? MINOR
- (f) Demands for government services? MINOR
- (g) Industrial and commercial activity? NONE
- (h) Utilities? MINOR
- (i) Transportation? MINOR
- (j) Safety? NONE
- (j) Other appropriate social and economic circumstances? NONE

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

Secondary Impacts NONE IDENTIFIED

Cumulative Impacts NONE IDENTIFIED

3. Describe any mitigation/stipulation measures: THERE ARE NO MITIGATION/STIPULATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION.

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: THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE IS THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION. UNDER THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE, THE APPLICANT WOULD BE UNABLE TO OBTAIN A WATER RIGHT FOR MUNICIPAL USE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WELL.

PART III. Conclusion

1. Preferred Alternative

2. Comments and Responses

3. Finding:

Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required?
 Yes___ No **X**__

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for this proposed action: AN EA IS THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF ANALYSIS FOR THIS

PROPOSED ACTION BECAUSE NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED
AS A RESULT OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

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

Name: PATRICK RYAN

Title: WATER RESOURCE SPECIALIST

Date: APRIL 22, 2009