

## DECISION NOTICE

### Indian Road Campground Kid's Fishing Pond

Prepared by Region 3, Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks

March 4, 1999

### PROPOSAL

Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks (FWP) proposes to assist the Broadwater Stream and Lake Committee with the construction of a fishing pond for youth and disabled anglers at the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation Indian Road Campground near Townsend, MT. The project is intended to provide a safe, high quality area for youth fishing and day use recreation. Construction activities include excavation of an existing pond to provide suitable habitat for fish, and hauling excavated gravel to temporary stockpile locations identified by the Bureau of Reclamation. The project also involves stocking trout from FWP hatcheries on an annual basis. The Bureau of Reclamation will retain ownership and administrative responsibilities for the site.

Total estimated cost of pond construction and associated landscaping is \$35,000. Funding sources include the Broadwater Stream and Lake Committee (\$15,000), U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (\$15,000), and Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (\$5,000). In addition, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks previously funded feasibility studies and surveys of pond topography. The ponds will be stocked with westslope cutthroat trout from the Washoe Hatchery on an annual basis at a cost of \$600 to \$800 per year for fish food and transportation.

### MONTANA ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT PROCESS

FWP is required to assess impacts of the proposal to the human and physical environment. The youth and disabled fishing pond construction project proposal and its effects were documented by FWP in an Environmental Assessment (EA) to satisfy the Montana Environmental Policy Act.

A 17-day public comment period on the EA ran from February 12, 1999 to March 1, 1999. Legal notices were placed in the Townsend Star and the Helena Independent Record detailing how to acquire copies of the EA and providing for comment on the proposal. News articles also appeared in these two newspapers during the comment period. The EA was sent to a standard mailing list, individuals requesting copies and posted on the State of Montana Electronic Bulletin Board.

An issue identified during the public comment period concerned the potential stocking of Yellowstone cutthroat trout which are not native to the area. In consideration of this comment, it is decided that yellowstone cutthroat trout will not be considered as a potential species stocked in the pond and the Draft Environmental Assessment will be revised to reflect this change.

Broadwater

## ISSUES RAISED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

The EA addresses issues in detail in Part III. Narrative Evaluation and Comment. These include: 1) Ground disturbance during construction activities; 2) Ground disturbance at gravel stockpile locations; 3) Overland discharge of sediment-laden water during pond dewatering and potential need to discharge into surface waters of the Missouri River; 4) Weed control; 5) Introduction of fish into a pond in close proximity to the Missouri River; 6) Safety for users of the pond; and 7) Costs of construction and future maintenance.

## SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

As of March 1, 1999, the Department received one written comment. Concerns expressed in this letter and responses to the comments, are presented in the following:

**COMMENT:** Project comment period was too short.

**RESPONSE:** The available time frame for constructing this pond is a very short period due to the brief duration of favorable conditions in the spring. During March, groundwater levels are at lowest elevation. This is the optimum time to initiate a project requiring dewatering and have the work completed before the water table rises during spring thaw conditions. The environmental review process could not begin until early February when the Stream and Lake Committee was able to finalize their agreement for the project and management of the site with the Bureau of Reclamation. These two circumstances led to a compressed time line for the environmental review and limited it to a period of 17 days. The local community has been involved with this project for over a year through various public meetings and fund raising events. Articles appeared in local and area newspapers publicizing the project along with appropriate legal notices. Copies of the EA and a request for comment were sent to 22 agencies, conservation organizations and private individuals. Private citizens and groups have shown their support for the project by raising nearly 50% of the necessary funds (\$15,000) through public events in the Townsend area. The project is widely considered to be a positive, community-based endeavor. Had significant issues been brought to light, which could not be mitigated, if the project was new to the public, or if there had been significant potential for public controversy, the comment period would have been extended or the project postponed until March of 2000. No such comments were received either in writing or by phone. The Department believes that in light of the publicity and community participation and support of this project, a 17-day comment period was acceptable.

**COMMENT:** Bottom sediment of ponds should be checked for tubifex worms and whirling disease vectors before pumping into adjacent fields.

**RESPONSE:** Whirling Disease is currently present in the Missouri River near the project area and any potential introduction of Whirling Disease vectors from the ponds would not result in a new introduction or exacerbation of the disease in the system. Dewatering of the pond is expected to take place for 10 to 15 days during March. The delivery

of disease vectors during this limited period of discharge would be very small relative to the natural transport of tubifex worms or disease agents that are transported in the Missouri River on a daily basis. For example, sediment loading for the Missouri River at the Toston U.S.G.S. gage is measured in units of tons per day, and measurements of sediment loading during the early 1950's revealed that minimum sediment loading occurred during February (51 tons/day) and maximum loading occurred during high spring flows in May (16,100 tons/day). Therefore, small quantities of sediments transported from the ponds should not significantly increase risk to aquatic life susceptible to whirling disease in the Missouri River near the project area. During dewatering, Best Management Practices (BMP) will be used to reduce or completely avoid delivering turbid water potentially containing tubifex worms into the Missouri River. These practices are regulated by Department of Environmental Quality and the Army Corps of Engineers to minimize any potential impacts to surface waters or wetlands.

**COMMENT:** EA seems inconsistent and inconclusive on exactly what species (of fish) will be stocked now and in the future.

**RESPONSE:** The EA states that 2-year old westslope cutthroat trout from the Washoe Hatchery will be stocked in the pond initially. Depending on the results of using westslope cutthroat, and future availability of these fish, the EA stated that rainbow trout and/or Yellowstone cutthroat trout may be alternative species that could be stocked in the future. Rainbow trout and westslope cutthroat trout are both present in the Missouri River near Townsend, and use of these species in a pond adjacent to the river is consistent with current management objectives for the Missouri River. Yellowstone cutthroat trout are widely stocked in mountain lakes of the upper Missouri drainage, but they are not currently present in the Missouri River in the vicinity of the proposed project. Despite the availability of these fish FWP concurs that use of Yellowstone cutthroat is inappropriate at this time. Rainbow trout may still be considered. No other species were proposed by FWP during the EA process.

**COMMENT:** Long-term fiscal projections for stocking seem unrealistically low. At 1,500 2-year old westslope cutthroat per year, it is hard to see how you can raise the fish, transport them over the Continental Divide from Anaconda and plant them in the ponds for \$1,000 per year.

**RESPONSE:** Bob Snyder of the FWP Washoe hatchery estimated food cost at \$483. Transport cost was \$109 and Per Diem for the driver is \$6.00. Total cost of these components comes to \$598 per year if fish are delivered in one trip. Stocking twice per year would increase the total cost by \$115. A very similar cost estimate was obtained by using cost estimates for stocking large rainbow trout (average length of 9.2 inches) at Canyon Ferry Lake. A document prepared by Gary Bertellotti of FWP in 1998, for the Canyon Ferry/Hauser/Holter Reservoir Working Group revealed that hatchery cost of stocking rainbow trout at 9.2 inches was \$0.47 per fish (\$706 for 1500 fish). Costs were based on hatchery operations, transportation, and Per Diem for personnel during stocking operations.

## DECISION

Utilizing the EA and public comment, a decision must be rendered by FWP which addresses the concerns and issues identified for this proposed project.

FWP's analysis determined that benefits resulting from the proposal will result in long-term opportunities for youth and disabled anglers to enjoy the proposed project, and that these benefits out-weigh the short-term disturbance caused by construction activities. Comments received identified issues which were adequately responded to in this document. No comments opposing this project were received.

After review of this proposal, an EIS is not required and it is my decision to approve this pond construction project and associated fish introduction and development of the site as a high quality area for youth and disabled anglers.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Korn", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael Korn  
Helena Area Coordinator  
Helena, MT  
March 3, 1999

MEPA/NEPA/HB495 CHECKLIST

PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

1. Type of Proposed State Action: Excavation of existing pond, stockpile gravel for future use, and stock trout to provide youth and handicapped fishing area at the Indian Road Campground north of Townsend, MT.

2. Agency Authority for the Proposed Action: Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks; U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

3. Name of Project: Indian Road Campground Kid's Fishing Pond.

4. Name, Address and Phone Number of Project Sponsor:

Broadwater Stream and Lake Committee  
Jack Sautter, Chairman  
41 River Road  
Townsend, MT 59644 (406) 266-4277

5. If Applicable:

Estimated Construction/Commencement Date: March 3, 1999

Estimated Completion Date: April 1, 1999

Current Status of Project Design (% complete) 100%

6. Location Affected by Proposed Action (County, range, and township):

Broadwater County; T7NR1E SECTION 30

7. Project Size: Estimate the number of acres that would be directly affected that are currently:

<u>Acres</u>	<u>Acres</u>
(a) Developed..... 0	(d) Floodplain..... 0.5
Residential..... 0	
Industrial..... 0	(e) Productive:
(b) Open space/Woodlands	Irr. Cropland..... 0
	Dry Cropland..... 0
	Forestry..... 0
	Recreation..... 1.0
	Rangeland..... 0
© Wetlands/Riparian..... 0.5	Other..... 0

8. Map/Site Plan: Attached to document.
9. Narrative Summary of the Proposed Action or Project Including the Benefits and Purpose of the Proposed Action:

The Broadwater County Stream and Lake Committee, a non-profit organization, proposes to enhance fishing and educational opportunities for children and disabled individuals to use and enjoy Bureau of Reclamation lands located at the Indian Road Campground. With the assistance of Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks and the Bureau of Reclamation, the Broadwater Stream and Lake Committee (BSLC) proposes to excavate approximately 7,000 cubic yards of gravel from an existing pond to create an environment suitable for providing fishing opportunities near Townsend, MT. The shoreline of existing ponds will be sloped during excavation to provide safe access to the pond perimeter. In addition to providing safe access for youth and disabled anglers, the project will provide a variety educational opportunities, including interpretive information on native species in the local area.

The fishing pond will be stocked annually by MFWP with approximately 1,500 westslope cutthroat trout grown at the Washoe Hatchery in Anaconda, MT. Depending on results of using age 2 westslope cutthroat trout at the Indian Road Campground Pond, and the future availability of these fish, rainbow trout or yellowstone cutthroat may be incorporated into future stocking requests at this site.

The majority of the excavated gravel will be stockpiled for later use by U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Stockpile locations have been identified at the Campground area, at an existing stockpile location approximately 1.1 miles north of the pond, and at a designated site located 0.5 miles east of the pond.. Cultural resource surveys were conducted at each of the possible deposition areas, and a 404 permit has been received to deposit excavated gravels.

Total estimated cost for the project is \$40,000.

10. List of any other Local, State or Federal agency that has overlapping or additional jurisdiction.

(a) Permits:

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Permit</u>	<u>Date Filed/#</u>
Army Corp of Engineers	404	1/19/99

(b) Funding:

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Funding Amount

Broadwater Stream and Lake Committee.....\$15,000

Bureau of Reclamation.....\$15,000

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks.....\$ 5,000

© Other Overlapping or Additional Jurisdictional Responsibilities:

Agency Name \_\_\_\_\_ Type of Responsibility

Bureau of Reclamation                      Owner of Property

11. List of Agencies consulted during preparation of the EA:

Bureau of Reclamation  
Army Corps of Engineers  
Dept. of Environmental Quality

## II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

### PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

1. <u>LAND RESOURCES</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unkgown	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
▶ a. Soil instability or changes in geologic substructure?		X				
b. Disruption, displacement, erosion, compaction, moisture loss, or over-covering of soil which would reduce productivity or fertility?			x		yes	1a
▶ c. Destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?		X				
d. Changes in siltation, deposition or erosion patterns that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed or shore of a lake?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to earthquakes, landslides, ground failure, or other natural hazard?		X				
f. Other _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Land Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

1a: Project proposal will temporarily cover idle ground with fill material. Re-seeding and weed control will help mitigate disturbance at excavation and stockpile locations.

### PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

2. <u>AIR</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
▶ a. Emission of air pollutants or deterioration of ambient air quality? (also see 13 (c))		X				
b. Creation of objectionable odors?		X				
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature patterns or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		X				
d. Adverse effects on vegetation, including crops, due to increased emissions of pollutants?		X				
e. ♦For P-R/D-J projects, will the project result in any discharge which will conflict with federal or state air quality regs? (Also see 2a)		X				
f. Other _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Air Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

3. <u>WATER</u>  Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
▶ a. Discharge into surface water or any alteration of surface water quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?			X		yes	3a
b. Changes in drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		X				
c. Alteration of the course or magnitude of flood water or other flows?		X				
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body or creation of a new water body?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?		X				
f. Changes in the quality of groundwater?		X				
g. Changes in the quantity of groundwater?		X				
h. Increase in risk of contamination of surface or groundwater?		X				
i. Effects on any existing water right or reservation?		X				
j. Effects on other water users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quality?		X				
k. Effects on other users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quantity?		X				
l. ♦♦For P-R/D-J, will the project affect a designated floodplain? (Also see 3c)		X				
m. ♦For P-R/D-J, will the project result in any discharge that will affect federal or state water quality regulations? (Also see 3a)		X				
n. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Water Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

3a. Pond dewatering during construction will require pumping water over a vegetated pasture/grassland area and water seepage will eventually reach the Missouri River. This water will travel over 1500 feet prior to seeping into the Missouri River. Permitting requirements are being coordinated with Joe Strasko and Fred Shewman of DEQ. A 404 permit obtained from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also regulates the destination of these pumped waters near wetland areas.

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

4. <u>VEGETATION</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Changes in the diversity, productivity or abundance of plant species (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?			X		yes	4a
b. Alteration of a plant community?			x		yes	4b
c. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		x				
d. Reduction in acreage or productivity of any agricultural land?		x				
e. Establishment or spread of noxious weeds?		x				
f. ♦♦For P-R/D-J, will the project affect wetlands, or prime and unique farmland?		x				
g. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Vegetation Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

4a-b. Covering of ground may alter plant species and productivity. Due to the small acreage and the temporary nature of the stockpile locations, impacts will be minor. Re-vegetation and weed control efforts will further reduce potential impacts.

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

▶ 5. <u>FISH/WILDLIFE</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat?		X				
b. Changes in the diversity or abundance of game animals or bird species?		x				
c. Changes in the diversity or abundance of nongame species?		x				
d. Introduction of new species into an area?			x		yes	5d
e. Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		x				
f. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		x				
g. Increase in conditions that stress wildlife populations or limit abundance (including harassment, legal or illegal harvest or other human activity)?		x				
h. ♦♦For P-R/D-J, will the project be performed in any area in which T&E species are present, and will the project affect any T&E species or their habitat? (Also see 5f)		x				
i. ♦For P-R/D-J, will the project introduce or export any species not presently or historically occurring in the receiving location? (Also see 5d)		x				
j. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Fish/Wildlife Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

5d. Introduction of westslope cutthroat trout, or other trout species in the pond, is compatible with fish management objectives in the pond and in nearby waters such as the Missouri River and Canyon Ferry Reservoir. If for any reason a problem develops with trout management in the pond, the stocking can be ceased and the lack of natural reproduction will result in a return to the present condition of the pond. Due to the presence of the Missouri River approximately 1000 ft from the pond, stocking of fish that is not compatible with the Missouri River/Canyon Ferry Fishery Management plan would not be acceptable.

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

6. <u>NOISE/ELECTRICAL EFFECTS</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Increases in existing noise levels?		X				
b. Exposure of people to serve or nuisance noise levels?		x				
c. Creation of electrostatic or electromagnetic effects that could be detrimental to human health or property?		x				
d. Interference with radio or television reception and operation?		x				
e. Other: _____		x				

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Noise/Electrical Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

7. <u>LAND USE</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Alteration of or interference with the productivity or profitability of the existing land use of an area?		x				
b. Conflicted with a designated natural area or area of unusual scientific or educational importance?		x				
c. Conflict with any existing land use whose presence would constrain or potentially prohibit the proposed action?		x				
d. Adverse effects on or relocation of residences?		x				
e. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Land Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

8. <u>RISK/HEALTH HAZARDS</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Risk of an explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or other forms of disruption?		X				
b. Affect an existing emergency response or emergency evacuation plan or create a need for a new plan?		X				
c. Creation of any human health hazard or potential hazard?			X		yes	8c
d. ♦For P-R/D-J, will any chemical toxicants be used? (Also see 8a)						
e. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Risk/Health Hazards (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

8c. Safety precautions for recreationist using the area during and after construction is the most important aspect of the project. Mitigation measures include: closing the campground during construction, placement of signs to warn potential swimmers and ice-skaters of risks, construction of an alternate ice-skating pond adjacent to the fish pond, construction of safe slopes along the shoreline to reduce risk of drowning, and future funding will be directed towards fencing and barriers to reduce risk of injuries due to traffic.

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

9. <u>COMMUNITY IMPACT</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Alteration of the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?		X				
b. Alteration of the social structure of a community?		X				
c. Alteration of the level or distribution of employment or community or personal income?		X				
d. Changes in industrial or commercial activity?		X				
e. Increased traffic hazards or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?		X				
f. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluation.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Community Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

10. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES/TAXES/UTILITIES</u>  Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Will the proposed action have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: fire or police protection, schools, parks/recreational facilities, roads or other public maintenance, water supply, sewer or septic systems, solid waste disposal, health, or other governmental services? If any, specify:		X				
b. Will the proposed action have an effect upon the local or state tax base and revenues?		X				
c. Will the proposed action result in a need for new facilities or substantial alterations of any of the following utilities: electric power, natural gas, other fuel supply or distribution systems, or communications?		X				
d. Will the proposed action result in increased used of any energy source?		X				
▶ e. Define projected revenue sources						10e
▶ f. Define projected maintenance costs.						10f
g. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluation.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Public Services/Taxes/Utilities (Attach additional pages of narra if needed):

10e. \$15,000 BWSLC, \$15,000 U.S. BOR, \$5,000 DFWP

10f The BOR, or as assigned, will be responsible for Administration of the area after the pond is completed and maintenance needs are not expected to significantly increase beyond current levels.

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

▶ 11. <u>AESTHETICS/RECREATION</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Alteration of any scenic vista or creation of an aesthetically offensive site or effect that is open to public view?		X				
b. Alteration of the aesthetic character of a community or neighborhood?		X				
▶c. Alteration of the quality or quantity of recreational/tourism opportunities and settings? (Attach Tourism Report)		X				
d. ♦For P-R/D-J, will any designated or proposed wild or scenic rivers, trails or wilderness areas be impacted? (Also see 11a, 11c)		X				
e. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluation.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Aesthetics/Recreation (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

12. <u>CULTURAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES</u> Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
▶a. Destruction or alteration of any site, structure or object of prehistoric historic, or paleontological importance?		X				12a
b. Physical change that would affect unique cultural values?		X				
c. Effects on existing religious or sacred uses of a site or area?		X				
d. ♦♦For P-R/D-J, will the project affect historic or cultural resources? Attach SHPO letter of clearance. (Also see 12.a)		X				
e. Other: _____						

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluation.

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Cultural/Historical Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

12a. Mike Andrews of BOR conducted cultural resource surveys and consultation with SHPO is pending and will be completed prior to construction.

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT**

13. SUMMARY EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE  Will the proposed action, considered as a whole:	IMPACT <sup>o</sup>				Can Impact Be Mitigated <sup>o</sup>	Comment Index
	Unknown <sup>o</sup>	None	Minor <sup>o</sup>	Potentially Significant		
a. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project or program may result in impacts on two or more separate resources which create a significant effect when considered together or in total.)		X				
b. Involve potential risks or adverse effects which are uncertain but extremely hazardous if they were to occur?		X				
c. Potentially conflict with the substantive requirements of any local, state, or federal law, regulation, standard or formal plan?		X				
d. Establish a precedent or likelihood that future actions with significant environmental impacts will be proposed?		X				
e. Generate substantial debate or controversy about the nature of the impacts that would be created?		X				
f. ♦For P-R/D-J, is the project expected to have organized opposition or generate substantial public controversy? (Also see 13e)		X				
g. ♦♦For P-R/D-J, list any federal or state permits required.						13g

\* include an attachment with a narrative explanation describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or can not be evaluated.

13g. 404 permit  
 Consultation with DEQ with potential need for discharge permit.

2. Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives (including the no action alternative) to the proposed action whenever alternatives are reasonably available and prudent to consider and a discussion of how the alternatives would be implemented:

No Action Alternative - The excavation of the Indian Road Campground pond would not be done.

3. Evaluation and listing of mitigation, stipulation, or other control measures enforceable by the agency or another governmental agency:

Review conducted by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Dept of Environmental Quality.

4. Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required? NO

The appropriate level of analysis for these proposals is an Environmental Assessment (EA) and EIS is not required. Based on this analysis, there are no significant impacts on the Physical or Human Environment.

5. Describe the level of public involvement for this project if any and, given the complexity and the seriousness of the environmental issues associated with the proposed action, is the level of public involvement appropriate under the circumstances?

The project is being initiated by a public, non-profit group that has received donations through annual fund-raising events. Thus, local citizens have shown enthusiastic support for the project. The Stream and Lake Committee asked for comments on the project via the local newspaper and received no negative feedback. This EA was sent to a standard mailing list and put on the State bulletin board. A legal notice will be placed in the Townsend Star newspaper announcing the Proposed Action, detailing how to get information on the project, how to get copies of the EA, and how to comment on the proposal. A 17-day public comment period (February 12 to March 1, 1999) was set and this level of public involvement was felt to be appropriate given the magnitude of the project. Written comments may be sent to Mt Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Indian Road Campground Fishing Pond, P.O. Box 1137, Townsend, MT 59644.

6. Duration of comment period if any:

17 days.

7. Name, Title, address and phone number of the Person Responsible for Preparing the EA:

Ron Spoon  
Fisheries Biologist  
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks  
P.O. Box 1137  
Townsend, MT 59644  
406-266-4237

### PART III. NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND COMMENT

- 1b Approximately 0.5 acres of idle ground will be temporarily covered with excavated gravel at the stockpile location. The proposed stockpile locations are located in previously disturbed sites to consolidate impacts to the extent possible. Site disturbance, covering, and compaction adjacent to the pond will occur during construction, but will be reclaimed and reseeded immediately after construction.
- 3a Partial dewatering of the pond during construction will require pumping into an existing settling pond and over vegetated pasture land. Depending on water table elevation, no discharge into surface water will be necessary. Discussions with Joe Strasko (DEQ) confirm that a discharge permit can be issued on short notice (approximately 1 week) if dewatering problems arise due to high water table elevations. Overland discharge will probably be required in the discharge permit to meet standards.
- 4a The pond construction design incorporates shoreline areas to act as wetlands to promote aquatic plants in selected portions of the pond. The temporary gravel stockpile will be reclaimed to promote growth of existing grass species and to discourage weed invasion.
- 5d Introduction of either westslope cutthroat, yellowstone cutthroat, or rainbow trout will be new species for the pond. These species are present in adjacent waters, and if fish were illegally transported from the pond to the Missouri River, no impacts would be expected on the existing or adjacent fishery.
- 10e The construction cost will require a one-time expenditure of \$5,000 from DFWP. Annual stocking of trout will cost approximately \$1,000 per year.
- 10f The Bureau of Reclamation, or as assigned, will be responsible for maintenance and BOR is responsible for Administration of the area after the project is completed.

Figure 1.

# Canyon Ferry Wildlife Management Area

