

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION
WATER RESOURCES DIVISION
WATER RIGHTS BUREAU

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

1. **Type of action:** WATER RIGHT PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 76LJ-P109503
2. **Applicant/Contact name and address:**
Mary K. Wilson
1042 Mountain Park Drive
Whitefish, MT 59937
3. **Water source name:** GROUNDWATER WELL
4. **Location affected by action:** SWSWNE, SECTION 35, T37N, R22E, TRACT 4 OF COS NO. 13578
FLATHEAD COUNTY
5. **Narrative summary of the proposed project and action to be taken:** THE DNRC SHALL ISSUE A WATER USE PERMIT IF AN APPLICANT PROVES THE CRITERIA IN 85-2-311, MCA ARE MET. THIS WELL WAS DRILLED ON THE OWNERS PROPERTY USING STANDARD WELL DRILLING PRACTICES WITH MINIMAL DISTURBANCE TO THE AREA. WELLS DRILLED IN THIS MANNER HAVE LITTLE TO NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT. THIS EA CHECKLIST WILL ADDRESS THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT DUE TO THE LOCATION OF THE WELL AND WILL ADDRESS THE CULTURAL IMPACTS TO THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT. WATER WILL BE DIVERTED YEAR ROUND AT A RATE OF 20 GPM NOT TO EXCEED 1.63 ACRE-FEET PER YEAR. THE WATER WILL BE USED FOR DOMESTIC USE AND A QUARTER ACRE OF LAWN & GARDEN PURPOSES IN THE GLACIER COMPACT AREA.
6. **Agencies consulted during preparation of the environmental assessment:**
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE (SHPO)
NATURAL HERITAGE PROGRAM (NHP)

PART II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1. Environmental Impact Checklist:

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Soils/Geologic Features:

Degradation of soil quality or alteration of soil stability, moisture content, geologic substructure, unique geologic features, archeological sites?

NO, A QUERY FROM NHP REVEALED FOUR FENS NEAR TEPEE LAKE APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE SOUTH OF THE APPLICANTS PROPERTY. A FEN IS A TYPE OF BOG, ESPECIALLY A LOW-LYING AREA, WHOLLY OR PARTLY COVERED WITH WATER AND DOMINATED BY GRASSLIKE PLANTS, GRASSES, SEDGES, AND REEDS. A FEN IS AN AREA WHERE THE SOIL IS ORGANIC OR PEATY AND ALKALINE RATHER THAN ACIDIC. THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY DOES NOT COME INTO CONTACT WITH THE FENS; THEREFORE, THERE WILL BE NO ADVERSE IMPACT TO SOILS. SEE ATTACHED NHP INFORMATION. RESULTS FROM RESEARCH OF SHPO RECORDS INDICATE NO KNOWN SITES OF HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE.

Erosion:

Alteration of erosion or siltation patterns that modify streambeds or lake shores?

NO, AS THIS APPROPRIATION IS FOR A DOMESTIC WELL NOT ADJACENT TO A WATER BODY, THERE WILL BE NO ALTERATION OF STREAMBEDS OR LAKE SHORES.

Vegetation/Noxious weeds:

Change in or adverse affect on diversity and production of local plant species including any unique or endangered species (including trees, shrubs, grass, and aquatic plants)? Establishment or spread of noxious weeds?

NO, SEVERAL PLANT SPECIES WERE IDENTIFIED BY NHP, HOWEVER ALL WERE LOCATED AMONG THE FENS. THE PROPOSED USE WILL NOT ADVERSELY EFFECT VEGETATION.

Air:

Deterioration of air quality or adverse effects on vegetation due to increased air pollutants.

NO

Water:

Alteration of surface water or groundwater quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, quantity, or distribution?

YES, SLIGHT ALTERATION OF GROUNDWATER QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION ASSOCIATED TO DOMESTIC WELL USE. THE FLOW RATE AND VOLUME ARE SMALL ENOUGH THAT THEY SHOULD NOT IMPACT THE AQUIFER.

Floodplain:

Changes in drainage patterns, course or magnitude of flood flows, or exposure of people/property to hazards (flood)?

NO

Wildlife Habitat/Migration:

Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat? Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of fish or wildlife?

A WILDLIFE QUERY FROM NHP LISTED THE GRIZZLY BEAR, THE COMMON LOON, AND THE HARLEQUIN DUCK AS SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN. THE SITE LOCATIONS ARE NOT LOCATED ON THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY. ALTHOUGH THE FOWL AND GRIZZLY BEAR HAVE A LARGE RANGE, THE PROPOSED USE WILL NOT ADVERSELY IMPACT WILDLIFE HABITAT. SEE ATTACHED NHP INFORMATION.

Endangered Species:

Adverse effects on any unique or endangered species?

NO, SEE **WILDLIFE HABITAT/MIGRATION** ABOVE.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Existing Land Use:

Alteration of or interference with the productivity or profitability of the existing land use of an area?

NO, THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPERTY WILL INCREASE THE PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITABILITY OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.

Historical Significance:

Destruction or alteration of a natural area of scientific or educational value or prehistoric or paleontological importance?

RESULTS FROM RESEARCH OF SHPO RECORDS INDICATE NO KNOWN SITES OF HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE.

Populace:

Alteration of the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area? Alteration of social structure of community?

YES, THE PROPOSED USE WILL INCREASE THE HUMAN POPULATION DENSITY BY ONE HOUSEHOLD. THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE COMMUNITY SHOULD NOT BE EFFECTED.

Transportation:

Increased traffic hazards or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?

THERE WILL BE A SLIGHT TRAFFIC INCREASE TO THE PROPOSED SITE.

Safety:

Creation of any health hazard or affect on existing emergency response or evacuation plans?

NO

Public Services:

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? Have an effect upon local or state tax base?

NO

Utilities:

Creates need for new or altered facilities for any of the following utilities: electric power, natural gas, other fuel supply or distribution systems, or communications?

THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY WILL NEED POWER IF THEY DO NOT HAVE IT YET.

Aesthetics:

Alteration of any scenic vista or recreation opportunity or creation of an aesthetically offensive site to the public?

NO

Other:

THE APPLICANT WILL BE INFORMED OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY NHP. SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN WERE IDENTIFIED IN THE VICINITY OF THIS PROJECT BUT WERE NOT IN THE DIRECT LOCATION.

2. Secondary and cumulative impacts: NONE IDENTIFIED

3. Reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the no action alternative:

- 1) ISSUE THE PERMIT, THERE IS A NET LONG TERM POSITIVE IMPACT TO THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT AND LITTLE TO NO IMPACT TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.
- 2) REJECT THE APPLICATION DUE TO UNKNOWN LONG TERM CUMULATIVE IMPACTS TO THE HUMAN OR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT. THE APPLICANT WILL NOT HAVE WATER FOR DOMESTIC USE.

PART III. CONCLUSION

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:

AN EA IS ADEQUATE FOR THIS ACTION. THE IMPACTS ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH TO REQUIRE AN EIS.

PREPARED BY:

NAME: CRISTY CARTER
TITLE: WATER RESOURCES SPECIALIST
DATE: [Automatic date code removed]