

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF FISH INTRODUCTIONS
INTO DAVE ENGSTROM POND #3**

Name and address of applicant: David Engstrom, Medicine Lake, MT
59247

Has the pond been approved for a private pond permit in the past?
N/A, pond will be stocked by FWP

Location:

County: Sheridan Township: 32N Range: 56E Section: 9

Name of the drainage where the pond would be located:

Unnamed drainage

Name(s) of fish species proposed for introduction: largemouth bass;
yellow perch and bluegill if and when available

Is this species native to the drainage? If not, was it introduced legally (i.e. by a fish management agency)? No, none of these fish are native to this drainage, but reservoir captures area runoff, and there is little concern by FWP for escape of introduced largemouth, yellow perch or bluegill into larger drainage.

List species of special concern present in the drainage: none known

RISKS:

Inlets to or outlets from the pond? Yes ___ No ___ **Explain:**

Potential for impacts on genetic structure of wild fish populations? None ___ X ___ Minor ___ Major ___

Comments required for minor or major impacts:

No minnow species are known to inhabit this pond at present

Impacts to any life stage of existing fish populations due to competition and/or predation? None ___ X ___ Minor ___ Major ___

Comments required for minor or major impacts:

Impacts to other forms of aquatic life that may be caused by this introduction? None ___ Minor ___ X ___ Major ___

Comments required for minor or major impacts:

Largemouth, yellow perch and bluegill will feed on aquatic insects and plankton in their early life stages, minnows as they mature

Potential for the proposed new species to reproduce in this location? None ___ Minor ___ Major ___ X

Comments required for minor or major impacts: it is anticipated that largemouth bass, yellow perch and bluegill population, once introduced, will become self - sustaining.

If necessary, would it be feasible to remove this species after it has been stocked? How? Rotenone could be applied to remove fish if necessary

Would this introduction result in impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? No

Describe reasonable and prudent alternatives to this action, if any (including no action). No gamefish exist in this reservoir at present, introduction will provide public fishery to area residents

Describe and evaluate mitigation, stipulations, or other control measures enforceable by the agency, if any. None necessary or contemplated

List any other agencies or individuals that may be affected by the proposed introduction: none known

List all agencies and individuals outside of FWP who have been notified of this proposed introduction: none, this reservoir is on private property and no negative impacts to surrounding landowners is anticipated.

Based on this evaluation, is an EIS required? Yes ___ No X If no, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action.

No significant environmental impact is anticipated by the introduction of largemouth bass, yellow perch or bluegill into this private pond.

Literature Cited:

EA prepared by: Bill Wiedenheft

Comments will be accepted until: July 9, 2007

Comments should be sent to: Bill Wiedenheft, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 54078 U.S. Hwy 2 West, Glasgow, MT 59230

Email Address: bwiedenheft@mt.gov

APPENDIX A PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT CHECKLIST

The 54th Legislature enacted the Private Property Assessment Act, Chapter 462, Laws of Montana (1995). The intent of the legislation is to establish an orderly and consistent process by which state agencies evaluate their proposed actions under the "Takings Clauses" of the United States and Montana Constitutions. The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution provides: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Similarly, Article II, Section 29 of the Montana Constitution provides: "Private property shall not be taken or damaged for public use without just compensation..."

The Private Property Assessment Act applies to proposed agency actions pertaining to land or water management or to some other environmental matter that, if adopted and enforced without compensation, would constitute a deprivation of private property in violation of the United States or Montana Constitutions.

The Montana State Attorney General's Office has developed guidelines for use by state agency to assess the impact of a proposed agency action on private property. The assessment process includes a careful review of all issues identified in the Attorney General's guidance document (Montana Department of Justice 1997). If the use of the guidelines and checklist indicates that a proposed agency action has taking or damaging implications, the agency must prepare an impact assessment in accordance with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act. For the purposes of this EA, the questions on the following checklist refer to the following required stipulation(s):

(List any mitigation/stipulations required, or note "None".)

None, the landowner requested FWP to stock his pond with largemouth bass and he stated that he will allow public reasonable access for fishing

DOES THE PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION HAVE TAKINGS IMPLICATIONS UNDER THE PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT?

YES

NO

- | | | |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | 1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights? |
| _____ | | 2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property? |

- | | | |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | 3. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property? |
| _____ | _____ | 4. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? |
| _____ | _____ | 5. Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? [If the answer is NO , skip questions 5a and 5b and continue with question 6.] |
| _____ | _____ | 5a. Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interests? |
| _____ | _____ | 5b. Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property? |
| _____ | _____ | 6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property? |
| _____ | _____ | 7. Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public generally? [If the answer is NO , do not answer questions 7a-7c.] |
| _____ | _____ | 7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant? |
| _____ | _____ | 7b. Has government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded? |
| _____ | _____ | 7c. Has government action diminished property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question? |

Taking or damaging implications exist if **YES** is checked in response to question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if **NO** is checked in response to questions 5a or 5b.

If taking or damaging implications exist, the agency must comply with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act, to include the preparation of a taking or damaging impact assessment. Normally, the preparation of an impact assessment will require consultation with agency legal staff.