

# **DRAFT**

# **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

## **Westslope Cutthroat Trout Restoration (Bryant Creek) and Introduction (Calvert Mine Pond), Big Hole River Drainage.**

**June 21, 2023**



## Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>Compliance with the Montana Environmental Policy Act .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Background and Description of Proposed Project .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Purpose and Need .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Other Agency Regulatory Responsibilities .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>List of Mitigations, Stipulations .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Alternatives Considered .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Terms Used to Describe Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Alternative 1: No Action. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Alternative 2: Proposed Action. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>Private Property Impact Analysis (Takings).....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>XII.</b>	<b>Public Participation .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>XIII.</b>	<b>EA Preparation and Review .....</b>	<b>53</b>
	<b>Appendix A: References .....</b>	<b>54</b>

## I. Compliance with the Montana Environmental Policy Act

Before a proposed project may be approved, environmental review must be conducted to identify and consider potential impacts of the proposed project on the human and physical environment affected by the project. The Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and its implementing rules and regulations require different levels of environmental review, depending on the proposed project, significance of potential impacts, and the review timeline. § 75-1-201, Montana Code Annotated (“MCA”), and the Administrative Rules of Montana (“ARM”) 12.2.430, General Requirements of the Environmental Review Process.

FWP must prepare an EA when:

- It is considering a “state-proposed project,” which is defined in § 75-1-220(8)(a) as:
  - (i) a project, program, or activity initiated and directly undertaken by a state agency;
  - (ii) ... a project or activity supported through a contract, grant, subsidy, loan, or other form of funding assistance from a state agency, either singly or in combination with one or more other state agencies; or
  - (iii) ... a project or activity authorized by a state agency acting in a land management capacity for a lease, easement, license, or other authorization to act.
- It is not clear without preparation of an EA whether the proposed project is a major one significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. ARM 12.2.430(3)(a));
- FWP has not otherwise implemented the interdisciplinary analysis and public review purposes listed in ARM 12.2.430(2) (a) and (d) through a similar planning and decision-making process (ARM 12.2.430(3)(b));
- Statutory requirements do not allow sufficient time for the FWP to prepare an EIS (ARM 12.2.430(3)(c));
- The project is not specifically excluded from MEPA review according to § 75-1-220(8)(b) or ARM 12.2.430(5); or
- As an alternative to preparing an EIS, prepare an EA whenever the project is one that might normally require an EIS, but effects which might otherwise be deemed significant appear to be mitigable below the level of significance through design, or enforceable controls or stipulations or both imposed by the agency or other government agencies. For an EA to suffice in this instance, the agency must determine that all the impacts of the proposed project have been accurately identified, that they will be mitigated below the level of significance, and that no significant impact is likely to occur. The agency may not consider compensation for purposes of determining that impacts have been mitigated below the level of significance (ARM 12.2.430(4)).

MEPA is procedural; its intent is to ensure that impacts to the environment associated with a proposed project are fully considered and the public is informed of potential impacts resulting from the project.

## II. Background and Description of Proposed Project

**Name of Project:** WCT Restoration in Bryant Creek and Stocking WCT in Calvert Mine Pond in the Big Hole River Drainage

Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks (FWP) proposes to restore native westslope cutthroat trout (WCT) in Bryant Creek and stock WCT in Calvert Mine Pond. Bryant Creek is a tributary to the Big Hole River upstream of East Bank Fishing Access site at Big Hole River mile 74. Historically, WCT were the only trout species in Bryant Creek, but introduced brook trout have displaced them except in the headwaters where a small, isolated population remains upstream of a natural cascade. Brook trout, which are native to eastern North America and were likely introduced to the Big Hole drainage in the late 1800’s or early 1900’s, outcompete WCT because of their high reproductive rate, aggressive nature and early emergence of fry in the spring (Shepard et al. 2005). Following

the Alder Creek fire in 2021, brook trout were able to access Trident Meadows, which is the headwaters of the Bryant Creek. Now that brook trout are present in the headwaters of the stream, FWP anticipates WCT will be eliminated from Bryant Creek within the next 5-10 years.

The cutthroat trout is Montana's state fish. Westslope cutthroat trout *Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi* (WCT) were first described by the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1805 near Great Falls, Montana, and are recognized as one of 14 interior subspecies of cutthroat trout. The historical range of WCT includes Idaho, Montana, Washington, Wyoming, and the Canadian provinces of British Columbia and Alberta. In Montana, WCT occupy the Upper Missouri and Saskatchewan River drainages east of the Continental Divide, and the Upper Columbia Basin west of the Divide. Although still widespread, WCT distribution and abundance in Montana has declined significantly in the past 100 years due to introductions of nonnative fish, habitat degradation, and over-exploitation (Hanzel 1959, Liknes 1984, McIntyre and Rieman 1995, Shepard et al. 1997, Shepard et al. 2003). Reduced distribution of WCT is particularly evident in the Missouri River drainage where non-hybridized WCT are estimated to persist in less than 5% of formerly occupied habitat, and most remaining populations are restricted to isolated headwater habitats (Shepard et al. 2003; Shepard et al. 2005). Further, many of these remaining populations are at risk due to small population size and threats from competition, predation and hybridization with non-native trout species.

The declining status of WCT has led to its designation as a *Species of Special Concern* by the State of Montana, a *Sensitive Species* by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and a *Special Status Species* by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). In addition, in 1997 a petition was submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to list WCT as "threatened" under the *Endangered Species Act* (ESA), 16 U.S.C. 1531, et seq. USFWS status reviews have found that WCT were "not warranted" for ESA listing (DOI 2003); however, this finding was in litigation until 2008 and additional efforts to list WCT under the ESA are possible.

To advance WCT conservation efforts in Montana, a Memorandum of Understanding and Conservation Agreement for Westslope Cutthroat Trout in Montana was developed in 1999 by several federal and state resource agencies (including the BLM, FWP, the USFS, and Yellowstone National Park [YNP]), non-governmental conservation and industry organizations, tribes, resource users, and private landowners (FWP 1999: MOU). The MOU outlined goals and objectives for WCT conservation in Montana, which, if met, would significantly reduce the need for special status designations and listing of WCT under the ESA. The MOU was revised and endorsed by signatories in 2007 (FWP 2007). As described in the MOU, *the primary management goal for WCT in Montana is to ensure the long-term self-sustaining persistence of the subspecies in its historical range*. To achieve this goal, the Westslope Cutthroat Trout Conservation Strategy for the Missouri River Headwaters of Southwest Montana was developed (Jaeger et al. 2022). This strategy describes specific, measurable objectives to ensure the long-term persistence of WCT in southwest Montana. The highest priority of the strategy is to secure existing, non-hybridized populations of WCT in place to conserve the remaining genetic diversity left on the landscape. Secure WCT populations are isolated from non-native species (usually by a fish barrier) and occupy enough habitat to ensure long-term persistence. Hilderbrand and Kershner (2000) recommended a minimum WCT population size of 2,500 fish for long-term persistence (>100 years) and Harig and Fausch (2002) recommended a minimum of 5.6 square miles (minimum watershed size) of occupied habitat.

The long-term goal for WCT conservation is to restore secure conservation populations of WCT to 20% of their historic tributary distribution east of the Continental Divide (Upper Missouri River Basin upstream from and including the Judith River; FWP 2019). Mainstem rivers, such as the Big Hole River, support important non-native recreation fisheries (i.e. brown and rainbow trout) and are not part of this conservation goal. FWP recognizes the value of non-native trout fisheries and will continue to manage 80% of the streams in the upper Missouri River for non-native fish such as brook, rainbow and brown trout. In the Big Hole River drainage, WCT historically occupied approximately 1,749 miles of streams and rivers. Today there are a total of 47 remaining

WCT populations in small headwater tributaries which occupy just over 100 miles of stream (~ 6% of their historic range). Of these 47 WCT populations, nearly 70% are at risk due to competition and hybridization with non-native fish. Data collected from streams in the Big Hole drainage over the past 15 years indicate that many of the WCT populations in the drainage have dramatically declined or have been extirpated (Olsen 2010; Olsen 2016; Olsen 2020). Projects that restore WCT, such as that proposed for Bryant Creek, are necessary to ensure the continued survival of the species, conserve remaining genetic diversity and meet statutory obligations to prevent listing under the ESA.

Bryant Creek is a tributary to the Big Hole River upstream of East Bank Fishing Access site. The fishery of Bryant Creek consists of brook trout and an isolated remnant population of non-hybridized WCT in the headwaters of the stream. There is no record of brook trout stocking in Bryant Creek but stocking records in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries are scant. The current brook trout fishery consists of roughly 200-400 fish per mile with an average size of 6 inches. Historically, WCT were the only trout species in Bryant Creek (Figure 1) but brook trout have displaced them except in the headwaters where a small, isolated population remains in 1.5 miles of habitat located within Trident Meadows. However, after fires in 2021 burned most of the drainage, brook trout were found in Trident Meadows. The presence of brook trout in the meadows and the habitat alterations resulting from the fire have put the Bryant Creek WCT population at high risk of rapid extirpation. Surveys conducted in the fall of 2023 suggest there may be as few as 50 WCT remaining in Bryant Creek.



**Figure 1.** Westslope cutthroat trout from Bryant Creek in Trident Meadows.



FWP proposes to conserve WCT in Bryant Creek and expand their range in the drainage by removing brook trout upstream of a constructed fish barrier (Figure 2). The fish barrier is located on US Forest Service land approximately 1.5 miles upstream from the Bryant Creek confluence with the Big Hole River. The non-native fish upstream of the fish barrier would be removed using rotenone, a naturally derived chemical from plants in the bean family that is highly effective at killing fish, with few impacts to non-target organisms. Rotenone acts by inhibiting oxygen transfer at the cellular level. It is especially effective on fish at low concentrations because it is readily absorbed into the bloodstream through the gills. There is little risk to animals that consume rotenone treated waters or dead fish because rotenone is readily broken down by digestive processes and is not readily absorbed through the digestive system; therefore, terrestrial animals can tolerate exposure to concentrations much higher than those used to kill fish. Rotenone does have minor and temporary impacts to aquatic invertebrates, particularly those that also breath through gills. Multiple studies have shown that at the concentrations proposed for Bryant Creek, invertebrates recover within one year after treatment with rotenone. Rotenone would be administered following label requirements, American Fisheries Society Standard Operating Procedures, and the FWP piscicide policy. Formulated rotenone (5% rotenone) would be applied at the label recommend rate for streams (1 part formulated rotenone to 1 million parts of stream water) with drip stations, which are containers that precisely administer diluted rotenone to the stream at a constant rate for 4 hours. In addition, backwaters, spring areas and small tributaries would be treated with backpack sprayers according to label specifications. The treatment of Bryant Creek would likely take 2-4 days and would be repeated in at least one consecutive year.

To prevent rotenone from traveling downstream of the proposed treatment area and affecting fish in lower Bryant Creek or the Big Hole River, potassium permanganate would be applied to the stream to neutralize rotenone at the fish barrier. Potassium permanganate is a strong oxidizer and quickly breaks down rotenone. (see Direct Impacts to Water Quality Section p 18 for more information). There is no risk to terrestrial wildlife and humans that come in contact with rotenone treated waters; however, per rotenone label requirements, public access to the Bryant Creek drainage will be restricted during the prescribed 2-4 day treatment period.



**Figure 2.** Fish barrier on Bryant Creek completed in the fall of 2022.

The year following the second rotenone treatment, environmental DNA (eDNA) sampling would be used to verify if all the brook trout in the stream were removed (Carim et al. 2020). eDNA uses genetic methods to

detect the DNA of organisms shed into the environment by sequentially filtering stream water collected throughout the treatment area. If a fish is present, its DNA is collected on the filter and its location can be identified. This technique has proven effective at detecting even a single fish in an entire watershed (Carim et al. 2020). If eDNA sampling indicates that brook trout remain after 2 treatments, additional treatments would occur until it is confirmed that brook trout were removed upstream of the barrier.

Prior to brook trout removal, the remaining WCT in Bryant Creek would be captured using electrofishing and held in untreated water during the treatment. After brook trout removal, the salvaged WCT in the headwaters would be used to repopulate the stream. Bryant Creek WCT would be monitored over the next 5-10 years to determine their response to restoration. Experience from other projects indicates that salvaged WCT which are released back to the stream following brook trout removal will thrive and fill the available habitat within 3-6 years (Clancy et al 2019; Olsen 2020; Feuerstein 2022). However, because of the few remaining WCT in Bryant Creek after the fire (approximate 50 fish), it is possible that there could be genetic impacts associated with inbreeding (genetic bottleneck and founder effect) that may affect the population's ability to rebound. If monitoring indicates low genetic diversity is slowing recovery, genetic rescue will be performed by importing WCT (generally less than 10) from neighboring populations into Bryant Creek to prevent inbreeding depression (Kovach et al. 2021).

The primary benefit of this project is the long-term conservation of WCT in Bryant Creek. This project would expand the Bryant Creek WCT population from 0.2 miles to more than 10 miles of occupied habitat and thereby prevent the population from being eliminated due to competition and predation by brook trout. The WCT in Bryant Creek would shift from an "at-risk" population to one that is secure and will be resilient for generations to come. This project would conserve the unique genetic legacy of WCT in Bryant Creek and add to the long-term conservation of the species. Once completed and combined with similar projects performed in the Big Hole drainage, WCT will occupy 209 miles of stream or nearly 2/3 of the 20% restoration goal. Collectively, WCT conservation projects like the one proposed for Bryant Creek are intended to secure a small amount of the overall fish-bearing habitat for WCT to ensure the species long-term, self-sustaining persistence while managing the vast majority of habitat (80%) for non-native fish like brook trout, rainbow trout, and brown trout.

In addition to cutthroat restoration, FWP proposes to create a new fishery in the Bryant Creek drainage in Calvert Mine Pond through the introduction of WCT. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine with high-quality water capable of supporting an additional recreational fishery in the area (Figure 3). The Calvert Mine Pond is 3 acres in size and nearly 100 ft deep with no surface inlet or outlet. A study of the water quality and other biotic and abiotic conditions in the Calvert Pit indicated that because the mine occurs in scheelite rock formation, which is non-acidic, there are no water quality issues in the pit or associated with the tailings that would inhibit aquatic life, including trout (Gammons et al. 2013). However, scarcity of suitable invertebrate habitat and low productivity of the water may limit the number and growth potential of trout stocked into the lake. FWP netting in 2021 found no trout in the Calvert Mine Pond, although anecdotal evidence suggests that in the past fish have been illegally introduced and survived but did not reproduce. Cutthroat trout stocked into Calvert Mine Pond would likely come from the Big Hole brood source housed in Cherry and Granite lakes or from the Washoe Park Hatchery in Anaconda and would be stocked as fingerlings at a density of 25 fish/acre every 4 years. Monitoring of the stocked fish would occur prior to the second stocking of WCT to ensure the fish survive and the stocking rate is appropriate to produce a quality fishery.






**Figure 3.** Calvert Mine Pond showing a shallow bay that is generally inaccessible to fish, thereby providing refuge for aquatic invertebrates. Western toads, which is a species of concern are also known to breed in this location.

An additional benefit of the proposed action is that two new WCT fisheries will be created. Catching a wild WCT in small stream in the Big Hole River drainage is rare because most streams are dominated by brook trout. Bryant Creek likely receives little fishing pressure because of its small size and the small size of trout. Studies, including some conducted in the Big Hole drainage, have shown that the abundance of most restored WCT populations are similar or greater than the former brook trout fishery. Further, maximum size of WCT is generally larger than brook trout in restored fisheries (Clancy et al. 2019; Olsen 2020; Feuerstein 2022). Due to the recent success of WCT restoration efforts in the Upper Missouri River, central district regulations have been changed from catch-and-release of WCT in streams and rivers to a 1 fish limit. The second fishery that will be created is the Calvert Mine Pond. It is anticipated WCT introduced into the mine pond would grow to 12-16 inches within 4 years of being introduced. The pond is readily accessible by vehicle and would provide an additional sport fishery to the area.

#### **Affected Area / Location of Proposed Project**

- Legal Description
  - Latitude/Longitude: 45.854151, -113.107873
  - Section, Township, and Range: T1N R12W Sec7,8,9,18,19; T1N R13W Sec12,23,24,25,26,35,36; T1S R13W Sec 6
  - Town/City, County, Montana: 10 miles northwest of Wise River, Beaverhead County Montana
- Location Map





### III. Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to conserve the native WCT population in Bryant Creek by removing non-native brook trout upstream of a constructed fish barrier and stocking of WCT in Calvert Pond to create a fishery where none exists today. FWP anticipates brook trout will eliminate WCT in Bryant Creek within the next 5-10 years. To prevent extirpation, FWP proposes to restore native WCT in Bryant Creek and stock WCT in Calvert Mine Pond.

FWP is required to manage fish to prevent the need for listing under the ESA, and listed, sensitive, or species that are candidates for listing under the ESA must be managed in manner that assists in the maintenance or recovery of the species (§ 87-5-107, MCA). Montana state law provides FWP with the authority for implementation of fish management and restoration projects (MCA § 87-1-702; § 87-1-201[9][a]) and allows the use of chemicals to remove fish (ARM 12. 7. 1503[1][f][ii]). ESA listing of a species can have significant economic and political consequences. Restoration actions like the one proposed help fulfill the states obligation to conserve native species and avoid ESA listing.

Projects that restore WCT are necessary for the following reasons:

- ensure continued survival of the species
- conserve remaining genetic diversity
- meet statutory obligations to prevent listing under the ESA

- satisfy the conservation objectives of the Memorandum of Understanding and Conservation Agreement for Westslope Cutthroat Trout in Montana (1999), Montana Statewide Fisheries Program and Guide (2019), and WCT Conservation Strategy for the Missouri Headwaters of Southwest Montana (2022)
- Increase WCT fishing opportunities. Establish a WCT fishery where none previously existed (Calvert Mine Pond).

	Yes*	No
Was a cost/benefit analysis prepared for the proposed project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

\* If yes, a copy of the cost/benefit analysis prepared for the proposed project is included in Attachment A to this Draft EA

## IV. Other Agency Regulatory Responsibilities

FWP must list any federal, state, and/or local agencies that have overlapping or additional jurisdiction, or environmental review responsibility for the proposed project, as well as permits, licenses, and other required authorizations. ARM 12.2.432(3)(c).

A list of other required local, state, and federal approvals, such as permits, certificates, and/or licenses from affected agencies is included in **Table 1** below. **Table 1** provides a summary of state requirements but does not necessarily represent a complete and comprehensive list of all permits, certificates, or approvals needed. Rather, **Table 1** lists the primary state agencies with regulatory responsibilities, the applicable regulation(s) and the purpose of the regulation(s). Agency decision-making is governed by state and federal laws, including statutes, rules, and regulations, that form the legal basis for the conditions the proposed project must meet to obtain necessary permits, certificates, licenses, or other approvals. Further, these laws set forth the conditions under which each agency could deny the necessary approvals.

**Table 1: Federal, State, and/or Local Regulatory Responsibilities**

Agency	Type of Authorization (permit, license, stipulation, other)	Purpose
USDA Forest Service	Pesticide Use Permit	Allow the application of pesticides on FS lands
DEQ	Pesticide Discharge Permit	Discharge of Pesticide to state waters
Department of Agriculture	Pesticide Applicator License	Authorizes rotenone application

## V. List of Mitigations, Stipulations

Mitigations, stipulations, and other *enforceable* controls required by FWP, or another agency, may be relied upon to limit potential impacts associated with a proposed Project. The table below lists and evaluates enforceable conditions FWP may rely on to limit potential impacts associated with the proposed Project. ARM 12.2.432(3)(g).

**Table 2: Listing and Evaluation of Enforceable Mitigations Limiting Impacts**

<i>Are enforceable controls limiting potential impacts of the proposed action? If not, no further evaluation is needed.</i>			Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If yes, are these controls being relied upon to limit impacts below the level of significance? If yes, list the enforceable control(s) below</i>			Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Enforceable Control	Responsible Agency	Authority (Rule, Permit, Stipulation, Other)	Effect of Enforceable Control on Proposed Project	
Piscicide Policy: Application rate and	FWP	Internal Policy	Regulates pre-project planning and neutralization of rotenone to prevent rotenone effects outside project area.	

neutralization of Rotenone			
CFT Legumine Label	MT Dept of Agriculture, US Environmental Protection Agency	The Montana Pesticides Act (MPA), Title 80, Chapter 8, Sections 80-8-101 through 80-8-405, MCA, Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act	Regulates safety procedures, application rates and neutralization of rotenone application.
Native and sensitive species management	FWP	Section 87-1-201(9)(a), M.C.A.	FWP is required by law to implement programs that manage sensitive fish species in a manner that assists in the maintenance or recovery of those species, and that prevents the need to list the species under § 87-5-107, MCA, or the federal ESA.
Westslope cutthroat conservation	FWP, DNRC DEQ, MT Stockgrowers, MT Farm Bureau Federation, USFS, BLM, USFWS, US Natural Resource and Conservation Service and 10 other signatories	Memorandum of Understanding	FWP is a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding and Conservation Agreement for Westslope Cutthroat Trout in Montana (FWP 1999, 2007) which states: "The management goal for WCT in Montana is to ensure the long-term, self-sustaining persistence of the subspecies within each of the five major river drainages they historically inhabited in Montana, and to maintain genetic diversity and life history strategies represented by the remaining local populations."
Westslope cutthroat conservation goal 20% of historically occupied habitat	FWP	State-Wide Fisheries Management Plan	Specifies a management goal of restoring westslope cutthroat trout into the Upper Missouri River drainage to 20% of their historically occupied habitat.
Upper Missouri Westslope Cutthroat Conservation Strategy	FWP	Conservation Strategy	Defines conservation of WCT by securing existing populations in natal habitat as highest conservation priority.
Pesticide Use Permit	USFS	Permit	<p>Stipulates all personnel will either be registered as operators under this license or will be licensed applicators.</p> <p>b) Standard Personal Protective Equipment and appropriate signing will be used (label requirements).</p> <p>c) Project will be coordinated with the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest</p> <p>d) National BMP's for Water Quality Management on NFS Lands will be implemented. Applicators and operators will adhere to FWP's Pesticide Use Policy and all product label requirements.</p> <p>e) Monitoring will be conducted using sentinel fish to determine the effectiveness of treatments and to ensure that rotenone is degraded to less than lethal</p>

			concentration. A colorimeter will be used to measure the residual neutralizing agent below the neutralization station.
Pesticide Discharge Permit	DEQ	Permit	Regulates pesticide application to waters of Montana and requires annual reporting.
Pesticide Applicator License	Department of Agriculture	Permit	Certifies and licenses annually all pesticide applicators, enforces the label requirements, mandates pesticide use documentation.

## VI. Alternatives Considered

### Alternative 1: No action

Under the “No Action” alternative, the proposed project would not occur. Therefore, no additional impacts to the physical environment or human population in the analysis area would occur because of the proposed project.

The no action alternative would result in continued status quo fisheries management in Bryant Creek. Although the no action alternative would not conserve WCT, the brook trout fishery would remain the same downstream of Trident Meadows and WCT would be limited to the upper meadows. Given the colonization of Trident Meadows by brook trout and the habitat degradation associated with the fire, it is likely that WCT will be extirpated from Bryant Creek within 5-10 years.

Loss of another non-hybridized WCT population would adversely impact the State’s obligation to conserve native fish and may contribute to potential future listing under the ESA. Although there is limited angling in Bryant Creek, the no action alternative would maintain the existing fisheries and provide uninterrupted opportunities for angling. The no action alternative would also avoid short-term impacts of rotenone on non-target aquatic invertebrates. However, the 2021 fire in the Bryant Creek drainage will likely result in a decrease in the aquatic invertebrate community and the brook trout fishery in the stream due to increased sediment and ash entering the stream and reducing habitat quality.

Under the no action alternative, no fish would be legally introduced into Calvert Mine Pond. The lack of fish in the pond would minimize any potential impacts to aquatic invertebrates and Western toad tadpoles and would not provide an additional recreational fishery in the area.

### Alternative 2: Proposed Project

FWP proposes to secure Bryant Creek WCT by removing brook trout upstream of the fish barrier using the piscicide rotenone. FWP would salvage WCT prior to brook trout removal and restock them once the project is completed. FWP also proposes to stock WCT in Calvert Mine Pond within the Bryant Creek drainage. Reference Section IX below for an analysis of potential impacts to the human environment associated with the proposed project.

	Yes*	No
Were any additional alternatives considered and dismissed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\* If yes, a list and description of the other alternatives considered, but not carried forward for detailed review is included below

### **Other Alternatives Not Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis**

### Alternative 3: Mechanically remove brook trout from the Bryant Creek.

This alternative would attempt to conserve native WCT in Bryant Creek by removing brook trout with electrofishing rather than rotenone. Multiple-pass electrofishing has been used to eradicate nonnative trout from several small streams in northcentral and in southwest Montana. Electrofishing can be an effective means of capturing fish in streams; however, successful eradication of fish using electrofishing is limited to small, simple systems (i.e., <3 miles



length, <10 feet wide, little to no instream woody debris; Shepard et al. 2014). Generally, electrofishing is only 50-70% efficient at capturing fish depending on the type of habitat and fish size distribution. Electrofishing removal is very labor intensive, inefficient at capturing juvenile fish, and requires multiple years to allow juvenile fish to grow to the size where they can be readily captured. The project reaches where electrofishing removals have been successful were generally less than 3 miles in length and required up to 25 electrofishing removal passes over several years to eradicate the target species (Shepard et al. 2014). Each electrofishing pass generally requires a crew of 3 to 9 people and would likely occur over at least 10 years. Ultimately, removing brook trout from Bryant Creek with electrofishing would likely be unsuccessful because of the length of stream (11 miles total) and the complexity of the habitat. Such an effort would be impractical and cost prohibitive given other methods for accomplishing the same goals, such as the proposed action. Further, it is uncertain if 100% removal of non-native trout could be achieved with electrofishing given the length of the stream and the complexity of the habitat in Bryant Creek. For these reasons this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

#### Alternative 4: Use angling to eliminate hybridized trout from Bryant Creek.

Under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Commission, FWP may modify angling regulations to remove unwanted fish from a lake or stream. However, this method would not likely result in complete fish removal or even significant reductions in brook trout abundance for several reasons: First, the proposed stream is small and likely currently receives little fishing pressure. Attracting anglers to harvest brook trout would be difficult because of the remoteness of the site, small size of the stream and generally small size of fish. Second, recreational angling has been shown to reduce the average size of fish and reduce population abundance, but rarely if ever has it been solely responsible for eliminating a fish population. Using angling techniques alone in the stream would not result in removal of non-native trout and would not achieve the objective of conserving native fish. Because fishing was considered unlikely to achieve the objective of complete removal of brook trout, this alternative was eliminated from further analysis.

## VII. Terms Used to Describe Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population

The impacts analysis identifies and evaluates **direct**, **secondary**, and **cumulative impacts**.

- **Direct impacts** are those that occur at the same time and place as the action that triggers the effect.
- **Secondary impacts** “are further impacts to the human environment that may be stimulated or induced by or otherwise result from a direct impact of the action.” ARM 12.2.429(18).
- **Cumulative impacts** “means the collective impacts on the human environment of the proposed action when considered in conjunction with other past and present actions related to the proposed action by location or generic type. Related future actions must also be considered when these actions are under concurrent consideration by any state agency through pre-impact statement studies, separate impact statement evaluation, or permit processing procedures.” ARM 12.2.429(7).

Where impacts are expected to occur, the impact analysis estimates the **extent**, **duration**, **frequency**, and **severity** of the impact. The duration of an impact is quantified as follows:

- **Short-Term:** impacts that would not last longer than the proposed project.
- **Long-Term:** impacts that would remain or occur following the proposed project.

The severity of an impact is measured using the following:

- **No Impact:** there would be no change from current conditions.
- **Negligible:** an adverse or beneficial effect would occur but would be at the lowest levels of detection.
- **Minor:** the effect would be noticeable but would be relatively small and would not affect the function or integrity of the resource.
- **Moderate:** the effect would be easily identifiable and would change the function or integrity of the resource.
- **Major:** the effect would irretrievably alter the resource.

Some impacts may require mitigation. As defined in ARM 12.2.429, mitigation means:

- Avoiding an impact by not taking a certain action or parts of a project;
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of a project and its implementation;
- Rectifying an impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment; or
- Reducing or eliminating an impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of a project or the time period thereafter that an impact continues.

FWP may, as an alternative to preparing an EIS, prepare an EA whenever the action is one that might normally require an EIS, but effects which might otherwise be deemed significant appear to be mitigable below the level of significance through design, or enforceable controls or stipulations, or both, imposed by the agency or other government agencies. For an EA to suffice in this instance, the agency must determine that all the impacts of the proposed action have been accurately identified, that they will be mitigated below the level of significance, and that no significant impact is likely to occur. The agency may not consider compensation for purposes of determining that impacts have been mitigated below the level of significance. ARM 12.2.430(4).

A list of any mitigation strategies including, but not limited to, design, enforceable controls or stipulations, or both, as applicable to the proposed project is included in **Section VI** above.

FWP must analyze impacts to the physical and human environment for each alternative considered. The proposed project considered the following alternatives:

- Alternative 1: No Action
- Alternative 2: Proposed Project

## VIII. Alternative 1: No Action. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population

Under the “no action” alternative, the proposed project would not occur. Therefore, no additional impacts to the physical or human environment in the analysis area would occur. The no action alternative forms the baseline from which the potential impacts of the proposed Project can be measured.

## IX. Alternative 2: Proposed Action. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment and Human Population

### A. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts on the Physical Environment

## 1. Terrestrial, Avian, and Aquatic Life and Habitats

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

#### **Bryant Creek**

The terrestrial and aquatic habitat and species present in the Bryant Creek drainage are typical of those found throughout the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest. Prior to the Christiansen/Alder fire complex in 2021, the area was heavily forested with primarily lodgepole pine, Douglas fir on the south facing slopes and Engelmann spruce and subalpine fir at higher elevations. The 2021 fires burned through much of the drainage leaving a mosaic of live and burned trees. The riparian areas of Bryant Creek are also heavily forested with the exception of a few meadow sections, including Trident Meadows at the headwaters, where willows are more common.

The aquatic habitat consists for the most part of moderate gradient Rosgen “B” type stream channel dominated by boulders and large cobble substrates. The fishery in Bryant Creek is dominated by brook trout with Rocky Mountain sculpin also being present in the lower reaches of the stream. WCT are present in the headwaters of the stream in Trident Meadows. Prior to 2021, no brook trout were present in Trident Meadows, but in 2022 brook trout were found in the upper meadow reaches. Under the no action alternative, the brook trout fishery would remain the same in lower Bryant Creek and the recent colonization of the headwaters of Bryant Creek by brook trout would continue to expand upstream.

The recent colonization of Trident Meadows by brook trout would likely lead to the extirpation of WCT in the next 5-10 years. Loss of another non-hybridized WCT population would adversely impact the State’s obligation to conserve native fish and prevent their potential listing under the ESA. The loss of any native WCT populations would be a set-back for WCT conservation. There are only 21 remaining non-hybridized populations of WCT in the Big Hole drainage, one of which is Bryant Creek. The fire in the Bryant Creek drainage in 2021 will likely result in a temporary decrease in brook trout abundance throughout the drainage as habitat conditions degrade due to lack of forest canopy and increased sediment loading to the stream. This reduced habitat quality would also occur under the proposed action; however, no fish would be present while the main input of sediment and ash flush through the system. By the time WCT are reintroduced to the drainage, sediment impacts would be diminishing and habitat quality improving.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine at the head of Calvert Creek, a tributary to Bryant Creek. The Calvert Mine Pond is 3 acres in size and nearly 100 ft deep with no surface inlet or outlet. Because it was a former mine, the margins of the lake are a series of bedrock terraces and there is little to no littoral area around the majority of the pond. There are 2 small shallow bays on the west side of the lake. One is the former flooded access road into the pit and the other is a shallow (less than 4 inches deep), small flat that has been colonized by wetland plant species such as willows, sedges and bullrushes and is an important area for western toad breeding.

### **Direct Impacts**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project may result in impacts to terrestrial, avian and aquatic life and habitats.

## Bryant Creek

### Terrestrial Habitats:

Direct, temporary impacts to terrestrial habitats would be expected and limited to trampling of vegetation by project personnel walking up and down the banks of Bryant Creek and its tributaries during project implementation. The treatment of Bryant Creek with rotenone would be performed by as many as 12 FWP, USFS and other partner personnel. Any trampling impacts on vegetation are anticipated to be unnoticeable within one growing season. Further, only a limited number of personnel would work on a particular section of stream each year (2-3) so potential impacts would be mitigated by a periodic lack of activity. These impacts would be further minimized by the use of existing trails and road systems to the extent practicable. Any direct impacts to terrestrial habitat would be short-term, negligible, and mitigated by personnel working primarily along the margins of the stream.

### Terrestrial and Avian Life (Generally):

Terrestrial and avian life may be temporarily displaced because of the presence of personnel working in the area during the application of rotenone to Bryant Creek and its tributaries. Further, the entire treatment is expected to last less than 5 days. Project personnel will also only be present in each affected reach of Bryant Creek for a single day (less than 8 hr) so displaced terrestrial life would likely quickly return to the affected habitat. Any adverse direct impacts to terrestrial and avian life (generally) would be short-term, minor, and mitigated by personnel working primarily along the margins of the stream.

### Mammals:

Mammals are not affected by rotenone at fish killing concentrations because, unlike fish, which are exposed to rotenone through their gills, terrestrial wildlife exposure occurs only through consuming treated water and/or fish killed by rotenone. Ingested rotenone is rapidly broken down by enzymatic action in the stomach and intestines (AFS 2002). Therefore, the low concentrations of rotenone used to kill fish pose no risk to terrestrial wildlife. Studies of risk for terrestrial animals found that a 22-pound dog would have to drink 7,915 gallons of treated lake water within 24 hours, or eat 660,000 pounds of rotenone-killed fish, to receive a lethal dose (CDFG 1994). The State of Washington reported that a half pound mammal would need to consume 12.5 mg of pure rotenone to receive a lethal dose (Bradbury 1986). Considering the only conceivable way terrestrial wildlife or domestic animals could consume rotenone under field conditions is by drinking treated water or consuming dead fish, a half-pound animal, such as a squirrel, would need to drink 16 gallons of water treated at 1 ppm rotenone in a 24 hour period to receive a lethal dose.

The EPA (2007) made the following conclusions for small mammals and large mammals:

When estimating daily food intake, an intermediate-sized 350 g mammal will consume about 18.8 g of food. Using data previously cited from the common carp with a body weight of 88 grams, a small mammal would only consume 21% (18.8/88) of the total carp body mass. According to the data for common carp, total body residues of rotenone in carp amounted to 1.08 µg/g. A 350-g mammal consuming 18.8 grams represents an equivalent dose of 20.3 µg of rotenone; this value is well below the median lethal dose of rotenone (13,800 µg) for similarly sized mammals. When assessing a large mammal, 1000 g is considered to be a default body weight. A 1,000 g mammal will consume about 34 g of food. If the animal fed exclusively on carp killed by rotenone, the equivalent dose would be 34 g \* 1.08 µg/g or 37 µg of rotenone. This value is below the estimated median lethal equivalent concentration adjusted for body weight (30,400 µg). If fish were available for consumption by mammals scavenging



along the shoreline for dead or dying fish, it is extremely unlikely that piscivorous mammals will consume enough fish to result in observable acute toxicity. Any direct impacts to mammals would be short-term and negligible.

#### Birds:

Similar results determined that birds, or avian life, required levels of rotenone at least 1,000 to 10,000-times greater than is required for lethality in fish (Skaar 2001). Cutkomp (1943) reported that chickens, pheasants and members of lower orders of Galliformes were quite resistant to rotenone, and four-day old chicks were more resistant than adults. Ware (2002) reports that swine are uniquely sensitive to rotenone and it is slightly toxic to wildfowl, but to kill Japanese quail required 4,500 to 7,000 times more than is used to kill fish.

The EPA (2007) made the following conclusion for birds (avian life);

Since rotenone is applied directly to water, there is little likelihood that terrestrial forage items for birds will contain rotenone residues from this use. While it is possible that some piscivorous birds may feed opportunistically on dead or dying fish located on the surface of treated waters, protocols for piscicidal use typically recommend that dead fish be collected and buried, rendering the fish less available for consumption. In addition, many of the dead fish will sink and not be available for consumption by birds. However, whole body residues in fish killed with rotenone ranged from 0.22 µg/g in yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) to 1.08 µg/g in common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*; Jarvinen and Ankley 1998). For a 68 g yellow perch and an 88 g carp, this represents totals of 15 µg and 95 µg rotenone per fish, respectively. Based on the avian subacute dietary LC50 of 4,110 mg/kg, a 1,000-g bird would have to consume 274,000 perch or 43,000 small carp. Thus, it is extremely unlikely that piscivorous birds will consume enough fish to result in a lethal dose. Any direct impacts to avian life would be short-term and negligible.

#### Fish:

The purpose of the project is to remove brook trout in Bryant Creek upstream of the fish barrier to restore native WCT and to introduce WCT to Calvert Mine Pond to create a new WCT fishery. Adverse project impacts would be minor because brook trout are the most wide-spread and abundant game fish in the Big Hole River drainage and the established fisheries management goal is to manage 80% of the available habitat in the Upper Missouri River Basin for non-native trout like brook trout (Statewide Fisheries Management Program and Guide, FWP 2019). Therefore, although the proposed action will result in the loss of a brook trout fishery, the vast majority of available fish-bearing habitat in the Bryant Creek drainage will be managed for non-native fish, including brook trout. Also, the loss of the fishery will be temporary because WCT would repopulate the available habitat and provide a recreational fishery similar to the current brook trout fishery. Further, the proposed project would create a new WCT fishery in Calvert Mine Pond, thereby increasing fishing opportunities in the affected area. Any direct impacts to brook trout would be short- and long-term but overall minor given the wide distribution and abundance of brook trout in the Big Hole drainage. The impacts to WCT will be long-term, major and beneficial (Statewide Fisheries Management Program and Guide, FWP 2019), .

Rocky Mountain sculpin are also present in the Bryant Creek drainage. Sculpin are susceptible to rotenone but have a higher tolerance than trout species. Recent studies suggest that sculpin generally survive rotenone treatments at the concentrations used to remove trout. We anticipate that sculpin will survive the rotenone treatments, but if subsequent surveys in Bryant Creek fail to detect sculpin, fish will be captured below the fish barrier and released upstream. Any direct impacts to Rocky Mountain sculpin are anticipated to be short term and minor and can be mitigated to avoid any long-term impacts.

## Aquatic Invertebrates:

Numerous studies indicate that rotenone can have acute and sometimes substantial impacts on aquatic invertebrates, but studies also show these impacts are short-term and that invertebrate communities generally rebound to pre-project abundance and diversity within 1 year. One study reported that no long-term significant reduction in aquatic invertebrates was observed due to the effects of rotenone, which was applied at levels twice as high as the levels proposed for this project (Houf and Campbell 1977). Some have reported delayed recovery of taxa richness (number of taxa present) following rotenone treatments, but many of these treatments were at higher concentrations than proposed in this treatment (Mangum and Madrigal 1999). Finlayson et al. (2010) summarized high concentrations of rotenone (>100 ppb) and treatments exceeding 8 hours, typically resulted in severe impacts to invertebrate richness and abundance. Conversely, lower rotenone concentrations (<50 ppb as is proposed in Bryant Creek) and treatments less than 8 hours (4 hours proposed in Bryant Creek), resulted in less impact to invertebrate assemblages. Chandler and Marking (1982) found that clams and snails were between 50 and 150 times more tolerant than fish to Noxfish (5% rotenone formulation). In all cases, the reduction of aquatic invertebrates was temporary, and most treatments used a higher concentration of rotenone than proposed for this project (Schnick 1974). In a study on the relative tolerance of different aquatic invertebrates to rotenone, Engstrom-Heg et al. (1978) reported that the long-term impacts of rotenone are mitigated because those insects that were most sensitive to rotenone also tended to have the highest rate of recolonization.

Temporary changes in aquatic invertebrate communities due to a rotenone treatment would be similar to what is observed after natural (e.g. fire) and anthropogenic (livestock grazing) disturbances (Wohl and Carline 1996; Mihuc and Minshall. 2005; Minshall 2003), though the physical impacts and resulting modifications of invertebrate assemblages after these types of disturbances can last for a much longer period than a piscicide treatment. Because of their short life cycles (Anderson and Wallace 1984), good dispersal ability (Pennack 1989), and generally high reproductive potential (Anderson and Wallace 1984), aquatic invertebrates are capable of rapid recovery from disturbance (Boulton et al. 1992; Matthaei et al. 1996). Headwater reaches and tributaries that do not hold fish would not be treated with rotenone and would provide a source of aquatic invertebrate colonists that would drift downstream. In addition, recolonization would include aerially dispersing invertebrates from downstream areas (i.e., mayflies, caddis, stoneflies). Therefore, the possibility of eliminating a rare or endangered species of aquatic invertebrates by treating with rotenone is unlikely. Further, the Montana Natural Heritage Program lists no aquatic invertebrate species of concern or potential species of concern in Bryant Creek. Based on these studies, FWP would expect the aquatic invertebrate species composition and abundance to return to pre-treatment diversity and abundance within one to two years after treatment. Therefore, any adverse impacts to aquatic invertebrate communities would be short-term and minor to moderate.

The fire that occurred in the Bryant Creek drainage in 2021 has and will likely continue to cause fine sediment loading to Bryant Creek until forest and riparian vegetation becomes reestablished. These fine sediments will likely cause reduction in aquatic invertebrate diversity and/or abundance. Performing the rotenone treatment during low abundance periods would reduce the overall impact to invertebrate species, as planned. Any direct impacts to aquatic invertebrates would be short-term and minor to moderate.

The introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond would have minor impacts on aquatic invertebrates within the water body. Aquatic invertebrates would likely be one of the main food sources for the introduced trout. Any adverse impacts would be minor, as habitat for aquatic invertebrates, except for

plankton, is limited in the pond due to the lack of a littoral zone. The steep sides of the former mine pit limit the available invertebrate habitat within the photic zone. Additionally, there are shallow bays present around the lake that may limit fish access where invertebrates can escape potential fish predation. To mitigate these potential impacts, FWP would initially stock WCT into the pond at a low density, roughly 25% of the typical stocking rate, which will mitigate potential predation impacts on aquatic invertebrates. Any direct impacts to aquatic invertebrates would be short-term and minor to moderate.

#### Amphibians and Reptiles:

Amphibians and reptiles potentially found within the proposed treatment area include: long-toed salamanders (*Ambystoma macrodactylum*), spotted frogs (*Rana pretiosa*), western toads (*Bufo boreas*) (amphibians), tailed frogs (*Ascaphus montanus*), western terrestrial garter (*Thamnophis elegans*), common garter (*T. sirtalis*) and rubber boa (*Charina bottae*) snakes. Rotenone can be toxic to gill-breathing larval amphibians, though air breathing adults are less sensitive. Reptiles would not be directly affected by the rotenone treatment because they are highly resistant to rotenone at fish killing concentrations. Chandler and Marking (1982) found that Southern Leopard frog tadpoles were between 3 and 10 times more tolerant than fish to Noxfish (5% rotenone formulation). Grisak et al. (2007) conducted laboratory studies on long-toed salamanders, Rocky Mountain tailed frogs (*Ascaphus truei*), and Columbia spotted frogs and concluded that the adults of these species would not suffer an acute response to rotenone at trout killing concentrations (0.5-1 ppm) but the larvae would likely be affected. These authors recommended implementing rotenone treatments at times when the larvae are not present, such as the fall, to reduce the chance of exposure to rotenone treated water and potential impacts to larval amphibians

Tailed frogs are present in Bryant Creek. Tailed frog tadpoles remain in fast free flowing streams for multiple years prior to metamorphosing into air-breathing adults. Short term and minor adverse impacts to tailed frog tadpoles would likely be realized during the removal of brook trout with rotenone. Similar projects have shown that only a portion of the tadpoles present in streams treated with rotenone are killed (Olsen 2017) and adult frogs are not affected. Therefore, it is anticipated that tailed frogs will recover following treatment with rotenone within 2-4 years. Further, the short-term reduction in the abundance of fish in the stream should facilitate tailed frog recovery by reducing fish predation on tadpoles. Four piscicide projects have been conducted in the Big Hole drainage where tailed frogs have been present and all affected areas show similar densities of juvenile and adult frogs 2 years after treatment.

Columbia spotted frogs and western toads have also been documented in Bryant Creek. Any reduction in amphibian abundance would be expected to be short term because of the low sensitivity of adults to rotenone, and because reproductive habitats will not be targeted for treatment as they generally lack fish. Spotted frogs and toads generally seek out shallow lentic areas for reproduction. Such habitats are not common in Bryant Creek which is moderate gradient with a narrow floodplain. These shallow habitats are generally found in ephemeral pools that do not have fish and therefore would not be treated with rotenone. Further, adult frogs would not be affected by the stream treatment. Any direct impacts to amphibians would be short-term and minor to moderate.

#### Calvert Mine Pond

The introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond could have adverse impacts on amphibians within the lake. Western toads are known to breed in the lake and use the shallow bays for juvenile rearing. Fish are known to adversely impact amphibians in mountain lakes, particularly larval amphibians through

direct predation. Any impacts to amphibians, including the western toad would be minor as the shallow bays present around the lake (Figure 3) would be used by amphibians for larval amphibian rearing. These shallow areas of the pond are not readily accessible to fish because they are too shallow for fish to access without also being exposed to predation. Therefore, these areas should provide refuge for larval amphibians to escape predation by introduced WCT. Further, abundant evidence demonstrates the coexistence of WCT and amphibian species in mountain lakes, including those present in the Bryant Creek drainage. The low density of WCT proposed for stocking should also mitigate potential predation impacts on amphibians. It is anticipated that no natural reproduction by introduced WCT will occur in the pond; therefore, if stocking were ceased the pond would revert back to a fishless-state, likely within 6-10 years. Therefore, any impacts to amphibians would be short-term and minor. Any direct impacts to amphibians would be short-term and minor to moderate.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Following treatment with rotenone, short-term and minor adverse secondary impacts to mammals, birds, amphibians, and reptiles would be expected due to the temporary and minor loss or reduction of food sources, such as fish and aquatic invertebrates in Bryant Creek. Mink, blue heron, king fisher and other potential piscivorous mammals and birds may be displaced for up to 2 years, while there are no fish in the affected 11-mile section of Bryant Creek. Any adverse impacts would be minor because no mammal species present in the Bryant Creek drainage are fish obligates and other potential food sources for these organisms will not be affected by the proposed action. Further, piscivorous avian species are mobile and, as such, would have access to other nearby waters where fish are more abundant. Therefore, any impacts to these species would be limited to temporary displacement until WCT repopulate the stream.

Some snakes are also known to consume fish from streams; therefore, snakes may realize a temporary and minor reduction in available food because of the proposed piscicide treatment. However, none of the reptiles known to be present in the Bryant Creek drainage are fish obligates. Further, WCT would be available to snakes within a few years after treatment. Therefore, any adverse secondary impacts would be short-term and minor.

A reduced abundance of aquatic invertebrates may temporally impact adult amphibians and potentially some bird species that prey on these species. Bird species such as the American dipper which feeds primarily on aquatic invertebrates may be temporarily displaced to nearby streams where invertebrates would not be affected. However, the aquatic invertebrate community is expected to recover rapidly and most amphibians and reptiles are not aquatic invertebrate obligates, relying also on terrestrial invertebrates for food. Therefore, any adverse secondary impacts would be short-term and minor.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Potential secondary impacts to terrestrial and aquatic habitats from the introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond would be through increased human use for angling. Increased use could lead to increased trampling of vegetation. However, given this is an abandoned mine site, vegetation (other than lodgepole pine trees which would be unaffected) is sparse. Therefore, potential secondary impacts to



terrestrial habitats would be minimal. Any secondary impacts to aquatic habitats would be short-term and negligible.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Cumulative impacts from the proposed project would include substantial benefits for WCT conservation. According to the Statewide Fisheries Management Program and Guide (FWP 2019), the WCT conservation goal for the Upper Missouri River basin is to restore secured WCT populations to 20% of their historical range. In the Big Hole drainage that would equate to 319 miles of stream. Additionally, the highest priority of the Westslope Cutthroat Trout Conservation Strategy for the Missouri River Headwaters of Southwest Montana (Jaeger et al. 2022) is to secure existing non-hybridized populations of WCT in their natal habitat to conserve the remaining genetic diversity left on the landscape. The Bryant Creek WCT restoration project would fulfill the two primary objectives of these strategies. When combined with similar projects performed in the Big Hole drainage and its existing WCT populations, once the Bryant Creek project is complete, WCT will occupy 209 miles of stream or nearly 2/3 of the total 20% native WCT restoration goal. Further, the proposed project would mitigate against the potential for future federal ESA-listing of WCT, as required by § 87-5-107, MCA.

FWP is unaware of any other past or present related state projects that would impact terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats in the Bryant Creek drainage. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. The same potential impacts, as previously described, would be expected.

## **2. Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

#### **Bryant Creek**

Bryant Creek is a relatively pristine basin with no known water quality impairments. In its watershed restoration plan, the Big Hole Watershed Committee lists only nutrients and physical habitat alteration due to agriculture and roads as potential water quality impairments (Big Hole Watershed Committee 2013). A relatively extensive road network within the drainage, used for both timber and mineral extraction, is the likely source of much of the fine sediment currently in the stream. There is one irrigation diversion on Bryant Creek, but it is downstream of the proposed project area and irrigates private property not associated with this project.

The Christiansen and Alder Creek fires of 2021 have had the most recent and significant impacts to water quality in the Bryant Creek drainage. In some areas where the fire burned hottest the ground is scorched and bare. Where these scorched areas exist on steep slopes, the potential for significant erosion and associated stream sedimentation exists. Eroded sediments and ash often enter stream

channels and can affect water quality. The extent of water quality impacts from the fire are still unknown. To date, mass wasting or landslide events have not occurred in the drainage because of the fires. Under the no action alternative, it is anticipated that water quality would improve in the stream over the next 4 years as vegetation becomes reestablished, hillslopes become stabilized and stream sediment loading is reduced. Road work associated with fire management and post fire mitigation has occurred in the Bryant Creek drainage and may also result in increased sediment loading to the stream. Under the no action alternative, naturally occurring water quality impacts related to the fire and subsequent fire mitigation would occur.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

A study of the water quality and other biotic and abiotic conditions in the Calvert Mine Pond indicated that because the mine occurs in scheelite rock formation, which is non-acidic, there are no water quality issues in the pit or associated with the tailings that would inhibit aquatic life, including trout (Gammons et al. 2013).

## **Direct Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed action would intentionally introduce the pesticide rotenone to surface water to completely remove non-native brook trout from the affected section of Bryant Creek. CFT Legumine (5% rotenone) is an EPA registered pesticide and is deemed safe to use for removal of unwanted fish, when handled and applied according to the product label. The concentration of rotenone proposed for use is 1 part formulation to one million parts of water (ppm).

Once applied to water, rotenone is susceptible to rapid natural breakdown through a variety of mechanisms. This first means of natural detoxification is influenced by water chemistry, water temperature, exposure to organic substances, exposure to air, and sunlight intensity (Ware 2002; ODFW 2002; Loeb and Engstrom-Heg 1970; Engstrom-Heg 1972; Gilderhus et al. 1986). Rotenone persistence studies by Gilderhus et al. (1986) and Dawson et al. (1991) found that the half-life of rotenone (amount of time it takes for 50% of the compound to naturally decompose) once applied to water was 3.5 to 5.2 days. The second method of natural detoxification is dilution, which occurs when untreated ground or surface water flows into a lake or stream. The combination of natural breakdown and dilution in streams usually results in complete detoxification of rotenone with 24-48 hours. In addition to natural methods of breakdown, rotenone can be rapidly neutralized through application of an oxidizing agent like potassium permanganate. This dry crystalline substance is mixed with stream or lake water to produce a concentration of liquid sufficient to detoxify the rotenone. Detoxification is accomplished after about 15-30 minutes of exposure time between the two compounds (Prentiss Inc. 1998, 2007).

Detoxification would be used in Bryant Creek at the fish barrier to prevent any treated waters from traveling downstream and affecting fish outside of the treatment area. Rotenone neutralization would commence according to FWP Rotenone Deactivation Procedures found in the FWP Piscicide Policy which states that detoxification with potassium permanganate will begin no less than 2 hours before the theoretical arrival time of treated waters at the detoxification station. Therefore, potassium permanganate application would begin no less than 2 hours before any rotenone treated waters would be present at the fish barrier and would continue until all treated waters have passed over the fish barrier.

Sentinel fish placed in the stream can survive for four hours with no signs of rotenone toxicity. The efficacy of the detoxification of rotenone in the stream would be measured in two ways: first, sentinel fish would be placed in the stream 30 minutes of water travel-time downstream of the fish barrier; second, residual potassium permanganate levels would be measured at the 30-minute downstream location with a handheld meter. A minimum of 0.5-1.0 ppm potassium permanganate residual at 30 minutes is required to fully neutralize rotenone. After the rotenone is applied, FWP would expect the rotenone to be completely broken down by natural detoxification within a 24 to 48-hour time period. At that time, neutralization with potassium permanganate would no longer be necessary. Any adverse direct impacts would be short-term, mitigated by the use of potassium permanganate, and minor.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond would not directly impact existing water quality, quantity and distribution.

### **Secondary Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Dead fish (brook trout and some Rocky Mountain sculpin) would result from the proposed project. As these fish decay they may cause secondary impacts to water quality. Bradbury (1986) reported that 9 of 11 lakes in Washington treated with rotenone experienced an algae bloom shortly after treatment. This is attributed to the input of phosphorus to the water from decaying fish. Bradbury further notes that approximately 70% of the phosphorus content of the fish stock would be released into the water through bacterial decay. This action may be beneficial because it would stimulate algae and invertebrate production. Any impacts to water quality resulting from decaying fish would be short term and minor.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

The introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond could have secondary impacts to water quality through predation of zooplankton by fish. Zooplankton consume phytoplankton as their primary food source. Phytoplankton are small, free-swimming plants and are what give water its emerald-green color in mountain lakes. However, given the low productivity of the pond and the paucity of plankton, the impacts to water quality are anticipated to be minimal.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact water quality, quantity, and distribution in the Bryant Creek drainage.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past, present, or future related state projects related to Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new

fishery. Therefore, no cumulative impacts to water quality, quantity, and distribution would be expected because of the proposed Calvert Mine Pond project.

### 3. Geology

#### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

The Pioneer Mountains are located near the eastern extent of the Sevier fold and thrust belt which is a region of overlapping thrust faults displacing middle Proterozoic to Cretaceous sedimentary rocks. These rocks have been intruded by granitic rocks of the Pioneer Batholith. Throughout the Pioneer Mountains, granitic rocks consistently intrude to the stratigraphic level of the Hasmak, Madison, Jefferson and/or Amsden carbonate-bearing formations. This combination of reactive carbonate sediments and input of magma and associated hydrothermal activity is an ideal environment to create skarns, base and precious metal veins/replacement deposits, and stockwork or porphyry deposits. The geology surrounding the Calvert Hill consists of at least two periods of folding and thrusting in the area. The earliest event produced the high-angle northwest striking and southwest dipping Foolhen thrust fault and placed Precambrian paragneiss over Phanerozoic metasediments. Later tensional stress caused left-lateral movement along the Bryant Creek tear fault. The Calvert mine is situated near the intersection of the Calvert and Bryant Creek faults (MBMG 2017).

#### **Direct Impacts**

##### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. No ground disturbing activities would occur because of the proposed project. Therefore, no direct impacts to geological resources would be expected because of the proposed project.

#### **Secondary Impacts**

##### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. No ground disturbing activities would occur because of the proposed project and neither the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the initial and ongoing stocking (every 4 years) of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any long-term or ongoing impacts to geology. Therefore, no secondary impacts to geological resources would be expected because of the proposed project.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

##### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects that would impact geology in the Bryant Creek drainage. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population from the affected stretch of Bryant Creek, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no impacts to geology of the affected area would be expected.

##### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts to geology would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

#### **4. Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture**

##### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

Because of the underlying geology of granite, gneiss and argillite, the soils in the Bryant Creek drainage are classified primarily as Cryoborolls, Cryochrepts and/or Cryoboralfs (SOLO 2023). The soil temperature and moisture regimes are cryic and typic ustic. Despite the steep hillslopes in the Bryant Creek drainage, soils are relatively stable. The fires of 2021, significantly reduced soil stabilizing vegetation but to date there has not been significant impacts on soil stability. However, until vegetation becomes reestablished, the potential for severe impacts to soil stability are possible.

##### **Direct Impacts**

###### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. No ground disturbing activities would occur because of the proposed project. Therefore, no direct impact to soils would be expected because of the proposed project.

##### **Secondary Impacts**

###### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. No ground disturbing activities would occur because of the proposed project and neither the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any long-term or ongoing impacts to soils. Therefore, no secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

##### **Cumulative Impacts**

###### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects that would impact soils in the Bryant Creek drainage. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population from the affected stretch of Bryant Creek, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no impacts to soils in the affected area would be expected.

###### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts to soils would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## 5. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

Prior to the Christiansen/Alder fire complex in 2021, the Bryant Creek drainage was heavily forested with primarily lodgepole pine, Douglas fir on the south facing slopes and Engelmann spruce and subalpine fir at higher elevations. The 2021 fires burned through much of the drainage leaving a mosaic of live and burned trees. The riparian areas of Bryant Creek are also heavily forested with the exception of a few meadow sections, including Trident Meadows at the headwaters, where willows are more common. Although the fire burned in a mosaic pattern, vegetation in high intensity burn areas was severely impacted and the ground was left bare and void of vegetation. Other areas were untouched by the fire and the vegetation quantity and quality was unaffected. Depending on burn conditions, vegetation is beginning to recover. Severely burned areas have little to no vegetative cover, even two years after the fire, because the soil and all affected roots and seeds were burned. Other less severely burned areas are recovering and ground cover is now present.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Short-term and negligible impacts to vegetation cover, quantity, and quality may occur because of the proposed project. Riparian (streamside) vegetation may be adversely and directly impacted by the trampling of plants from project personnel walking up and down the banks of Bryant Creek and its tributaries to conduct the work necessary for the proposed project. The rotenone treatment of Bryant Creek would be performed by about 12 FWP, USFS, and other partner personnel. Further, only a limited number of personnel (2-3) would operate in each affected stream reach at any given time, thereby mitigating any potential impacts from trampling of plants. Two sensitive plant species are potentially present in the Bryant Creek drainage (whitebark pine and Lemhi Beardtongue); however neither of these identified sensitive species is likely to be present in the riparian area where most foot traffic would occur to accommodate the proposed project. It is expected any impacts to plants would be unnoticeable within one growing season. Additional mitigation would occur by project personnel accessing the affected area(s) using existing trail and road systems to the extent practicable. Historically, human activity has been limited in and no cattle grazing currently occurs in the Bryant Creek drainage. Any adverse direct impacts would be short-term, negligible, and mitigated by personnel work practices intended to limit impacts.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond would not directly impact vegetation.



## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Rotenone does not affect plants at concentrations used to kill fish as plants lack the rapid absorption route fish possess (gills). Further, no secondary impacts would be expected from the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond. Therefore, no secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, the same potential direct and secondary impacts to vegetation, as previously described, would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact vegetation cover, quantity, and quality in the affected area. Further, no ground disturbing activities would occur because of the proposed project. Therefore, no cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts to vegetation would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **6. Aesthetics**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

The aesthetic resources of the Bryant Creek drainage include steep mountain forests with small, fast flowing streams. Roads, past mining activities and timber harvest have historically impacted the natural aesthetics of the drainage. The fires in 2021 significantly changed the aesthetics of the drainage leaving charred ground and vegetation in place of once mature forest stands (see Existing Environment/No Action Alternative for Terrestrial, Avian, and Aquatic Life and Habitats above).

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Dead fish would result from the proposed Bryant Creek project and may cause objectionable odors. Most of the dead fish will naturally sink to the bottom and decay, complete decomposition would be expected in 1-2 weeks.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond would not directly impact aesthetics of the affected area.

### **Secondary Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Neither the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would impact the long-term aesthetic nature of the affected area in any way. Therefore, no secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact aesthetics of the affected area.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts to aesthetics would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **7. Air Quality**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative:**

Air quality in the area affected by the proposed project is currently unclassifiable or in compliance with applicable National ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). Further, no significant point-sources of air pollution exist in the area affected by the proposed project. Existing sources of air pollution in the area are limited and generally include unpaved county roads (fugitive dust source), vehicle exhaust emissions, and various agricultural practices (vehicle exhaust emissions and fugitive dust).

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Culvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Under the proposed action, vehicles used to transport equipment and personnel to and from the project area will cause exhaust fumes and road dust. Such impacts would be short-term and negligible. The proposed project would not cause or contribute to a violation of any applicable NAAQS, as there are no air quality

restrictions in the area and the amount and duration of the emissions would be short-term and negligible. Most roads that would be used to perform the work described above are unimproved dirt roads; therefore, as vehicles travel the roads fugitive dust would be generated. The production of fugitive dust may pose localized and negligible impacts to air quality and would not exceed those posed by typical (pre-project) vehicle and ATV traffic on the affected roads. Further, the affected roads would be closed to public use during rotenone treatment of the stream and for a 2 to 4-day period following treatment. Therefore, public traffic would be reduced or eliminated when project related traffic is occurring, thereby mitigating any potential impacts from increased use of the affected roads during the proposed project. Any impacts to air quality would be short-term, mitigated by work practices, and negligible.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Neither the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any ongoing, long-term air quality impacts. Therefore, no secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact aesthetics of the affected area.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts to air quality would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **8. Unique, Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative.**

The Montana Natural Heritage Program lists the Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) and grizzly bear (*Ursos arctos*) as Threatened Species that may be present in the Bryant Creek drainage. Species of Concern that may be present in the drainage include wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) (mammal), westslope cutthroat trout, Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*), western pearlshell mussels (*Margaritifera falcata*) (aquatic organisms), northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*), great gray owl (*Strix nebulosa*), brown creeper (*Certhia americana*), evening grosbeak (*Coccothraustes vespertinus*), Cassin's finch (*Haemorhous*

*cassinii*), pileated woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*), sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) (birds), western toad (*Anaxyrus boreas*) (amphibian), Schreber's Dicranella (*Dicranella schreberiana*) (moss), whitebark pine (*Pinus albicaulis*) and Lemhi Beardtongue (*Penstemon lemhiensis*) (plants).

The fire that occurred in the Bryant Creek drainage in 2021 has significantly affected the habitat for all species in the Bryant Creek drainage including, those threatened and species of concern listed above. The landscape and biota continue to recover from the effects of the fire; therefore, ongoing limited impacts associated with the fire would continue for all species that inhabit the affected area. WCT are in significant peril and would likely be extirpated from the Bryant Creek drainage due to the recent colonization of the headwaters of the stream by brook trout. Brook trout are known to compete with and prey upon native WCT, which may result in the loss of WCT from the affected stream. Brook trout are the main cause for WCT decline in the Big Hole drainage. In other streams in the Big Hole drainage colonized by brook trout, where WCT once existed in isolation, WCT were extirpated from the affected stream within 5-10 years. The loss of WCT from Bryant Creek would be a significant impact to the long-term conservation goals for native WCT, as the Bryant Creek population represents one of only 21 populations of non-hybridized WCT left in the Big Hole drainage and the potentially unique genetic legacy of the fish would be permanently lost.

## **Direct Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project is located within potential grizzly bear habitat, but there are no known grizzly bears currently inhabiting the area. Further, the proposed project would have little or no impact on grizzly bears because mammals are not sensitive to rotenone at concentrations used to kill fish. There would be no impact on grizzly bears that consume fish killed by rotenone or treated waters. See analysis of impacts to *Terrestrial, Avian, and Aquatic Life and Habitats* for additional discussion of potential rotenone impacts on mammals. Direct potential impacts to grizzly bears would include potential short-term (< one week) displacement due to increased human presence along the affected section of Bryant Creek and the Calvert Mine Pond.

The proposed project is also within the range of the Canada lynx. Lynx are known to be present near the project area (Pintler Mountains) but there are no known lynx in the Bryant Creek drainage nor in the area of Calvert Mine Pond. Adverse impacts to any Lynx that may use or travel through the affected area include temporary only temporary displacement when personnel are present. The affected area, which may be used by Lynx, includes multiple drainages with similar habitat structure and resources; therefore, it would be expected such areas would be readily used by any Lynx or Grizzly Bears that may be located within or pass through the affected area.

No impacts would be expected from Grizzly Bears or Lynx consuming treated waters or fish killed by rotenone for the reasons previously noted. See analysis of impacts to *Terrestrial, Avian, and Aquatic Life and Habitats* for additional discussion of potential rotenone impacts on mammals. Therefore, any impacts to grizzly bears or lynx would be short-term and minor. Further, given the existing impacts of fire in the affected area, it is likely both grizzly bears and/or lynx would seek out other areas of more suitable habitat and not likely be present in the area affected by the proposed project.

Wolverine, great gray owl, brown creeper, evening grosbeak, Cassin's finch, pileated woodpecker, and sage grouse are listed as species of special concern present in the affected area. Direct impacts may include temporary displacement of these species of concern due to increased human activity in the

drainage. No machinery, helicopters or other heavy equipment would be used during the project. Pickup trucks and possibly ATVs would be used on existing open roads to access the streams. Personnel would further limit potential impacts by travelling up and down the stream on foot and accessing Calvert Mine Pond using existing roads.

#### Aquatic Life:

WCT are considered a Sensitive Species and a Species of Concern. The intent of the proposed project is to conserve native WCT by removing non-native brook trout from Bryant Creek and stocking WCT in Calvert Mine Pond to develop a fishery where none previously existed. Native WCT, which exist only in the headwaters of Bryant Creek, would be secured within more than 11 miles of habitat. Therefore, it is anticipated any direct impacts to WCT in the affected area would be long-term, moderate, and beneficial.

Arctic grayling is a Species of Concern in Montana. The species was petitioned for listing under the ESA and was a candidate species for several years. In 2020 the USFSW determined that listing the Arctic grayling was not warranted at that time and a lawsuit was filed shortly after objecting to the decision. Recent surveys did not find any grayling in the affected section of Bryant Creek or any evidence that the stream in this location is used by Arctic grayling for spawning or rearing. Therefore, no impacts to grayling would be expected because of the proposed project. Further, there is abundant, high-quality habitat in Bryant Creek downstream of the fish barrier for spawning, rearing and seasonal grayling use that may migrate into Bryant Creek from the Big Hole River. Grayling would not migrate to the affected area of Bryant Creek because of the existing fish barrier downstream of the project area. No grayling, or fish of any kind, currently live in Calvert Mine Pond. Therefore, no impacts to grayling would be expected because of the proposed project.

Western pearlshell mussels are also an aquatic Species of Concern known to occur in the vicinity of the proposed project area; however, no pearlshell mussels have been documented in Bryant Creek or Calvert Mine Pond. Further, western pearlshell mussels would be unaffected by rotenone at concentrations used to kill fish. Therefore, no impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

Western toads are present in the Bryant Creek drainage and the proposed action could have minor impacts on larval toads. Rotenone can affect larval amphibians including western toads because larval amphibians respire through their skin and gills. These impacts are expected to be minor because western toads select lentic waters for reproduction and the rearing of tadpoles typically does not occur in flowing streams such as Bryant Creek. WCT introduced to Calvert Mine Pond may prey upon western toad tadpoles. Tadpoles in the pond have been found primarily in the shallow margins of two bays. Western toads would likely continue to use the shallow areas of the pond for reproduction and associated rearing activities. Because the affected bays are too shallow to facilitate WCT access, no impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Further, experience demonstrates a lack of impact. Historically, brook trout were illegally introduced to the pond and no adverse impact on the toad population was realized as a result. Therefore, it is expected any impacts because of the proposed project would be long-term and negligible.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The restoration of WCT to Bryant Creek would benefit Western pearlshell mussels, if any remain in the

affected section of Bryant Creek. Mussels require a fish host to complete their life cycle and their native host is WCT. Brook trout can host larval mussels on their gills but recent studies suggest non-native fish, such as brook trout, develop a natural immunity to larval mussel colonization which does not occur for WCT. Therefore, if a remnant mussel population remains in Bryant Creek, the restoration of WCT could benefit species reproduction and aid in its potential future restoration and/or long-term persistence in the stream. Any impacts would be long-term, moderate, and beneficial.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. No pearlshell mussels have been documented in Calvert Mine Pond. Mussels require a fish host to complete their life cycle and their native host is WCT. Because WCT would be introduced into the pond, any impacts would be long-term, moderate, and beneficial.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Cumulatively the proposed project would benefit WCT conservation efforts, which would help FWP meet its obligation to prevent species from becoming listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA. The long-term goal for WCT conservation is to restore secure conservation populations of WCT to 20% of their historic tributary distribution east of the Continental Divide (Upper Missouri River Basin upstream from and including the Judith River; FWP 2019). Once the proposed project is completed and combined with similar projects performed in the Big Hole drainage, WCT will occupy 209 miles of stream or nearly 2/3 of the 20% restoration goal. Collectively, WCT conservation projects like the one proposed for Bryant Creek are intended to secure a small amount of the overall fish-bearing habitat for WCT to ensure the species long-term, self-sustaining persistence while managing the vast majority of habitat (80%) for non-native fish like brook trout, rainbow trout, and brown trout.

FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatments are unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact aesthetics of the affected area.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **9. Historical and Archaeological Sites**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**



Historical resources in the Bryant Creek drainage include evidence of past logging and mining. The open pit Calvert Mine is probably the largest historical site in the drainage. Remnants of old logging and mining cabins are also present in the drainage. Prehistoric resources are also likely present in the drainage but not well documented.

## **Direct Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. No ground disturbance would occur because of the proposed project. Therefore, no direct impacts to cultural resources (historical, archaeological) would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. No ground disturbance would occur because of the proposed project. In addition, neither the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any ongoing, long-term impacts to any cultural resources in the area affected by the proposed project. Therefore, no adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact aesthetics of the affected area.

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No cumulative impacts to cultural resources would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **10.Demands on Environmental Resources of Land, Water, Air, and Energy**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

The existing aquatic and terrestrial resources have been described previously in this document. Because the project area is entirely on the publicly owned and managed Deerlodge National Forest there are no known current demands on land, water, air or energy.

## **Direct Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse impacts to demands on the environmental resources of land, water, air, and energy would be expected because of the proposed project. Fuel would be required to operate equipment used for the proposed project. However, any impacts would be limited by the anticipated short timeline of the proposed project and, as such, the amount of fuel used would be negligible. Therefore, any impacts to the demands for energy would be short-term and negligible. As identified previously through the analyses of potential impacts to water quality, quantity, and distribution; soil quality, stability, and moisture; vegetation cover, quantity, and quality; and air quality; some impacts to the environmental resources of land, water, and air may occur because of the proposed project. However, any such impacts would be short-term and negligible or minor (see cited impacts analyses above). No other impacts to the demands on environmental resources of land, water, air, and energy would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Neither the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any ongoing, long-term impacts to demands for the environmental resources of land, water, air, and energy. Therefore, no secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact aesthetics of the affected area.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No cumulative impacts to demands for the environmental resources of land, water, air, and energy would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **B. Evaluation and Summary of Potential Impacts of the Proposed Project on the Human Environment**

## 1. Social Structures and Mores

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

WCT and Yellowstone cutthroat trout (YCT) represent the two subspecies of native cutthroat found in Montana and together they have been designated Montana's state fish. Many Montanans and visitors to the state hold high regard for WCT as an angling resource, an icon of the state, and a valuable component of the ecosystems in which they reside. As such, WCT, and associated recreational values, are deeply engrained in the customs and lifestyles of residents and visitors to Montana alike.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The restoration of WCT to Bryant Creek may be viewed as restoring the cultural values of the existing and historic human population in the area affected by the proposed project. As the only native trout to Bryant Creek, restoration of WCT would revert the fishery to its aboriginal state. WCT restoration projects state-wide generally have the support of indigenous tribes and many whom enjoy fishing for and otherwise appreciate native species on the landscape. Others who recreate on Bryant Creek may view the loss of the existing and invasive brook trout fishery as an adverse impact. Brook trout have been present in Bryant Creek for over a century. Any direct impacts associated with the elimination of brook trout from the affected section of the stream would be mitigated by other opportunities to fish for the species, as numerous surrounding streams will continue to provide brook trout fisheries, including the 1.5 miles of Bryant Creek downstream of the fish barrier where the brook trout fishery would be unaffected by the proposed project.

The intent of the proposed project is to sustain native WCT by eliminating competition from non-native and invasive brook trout. Therefore, the proposed project would directly benefit any person who enjoys fishing for WCT or otherwise values the species' existence, the State of Montana, and the ecosystem in which they reside. Further loss of WCT conservation populations would result in a reduction in the remaining range of WCT and could lead to listing under the ESA, changing state management of the species, and likely limiting public opportunity to fish for and otherwise interact with and enjoy this native fish species in Bryant Creek. It is also possible that WCT would become locally extinct (extirpated) in Bryant Creek, thereby forever altering this valued species. Any direct impacts from the proposed project would be long-term, beneficial, and moderate.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Stocking WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would provide an additional opportunity for the affected human population to fish for or otherwise enjoy WCT in a setting where they have not previously existed. Any direct impacts would be long-term, moderate, and beneficial.

### **Secondary Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Neither the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any ongoing, long-term impacts to current land use or

human activities in the affected area. However, many Montanans, and those visiting the state for outdoor recreational purposes, hold high regard for the conservation of native species on the landscape, including WCT. Under the no action alternative, it is likely WCT would be extirpated from Bryant Creek within 5-10 years. Therefore, because the proposed project would sustain and improve WCT populations and associated recreational opportunities in the affected area, the proposed project would preserve important pre-project social structures, customs, values, and conventions associated with WCT in the affected area.

Again, others who recreate on Bryant Creek may view the loss of the existing and invasive brook trout fishery as an adverse impact as brook trout have been present in Bryant Creek for over a century. However, any secondary impacts associated with the elimination of brook trout from the affected section of the Bryant Creek would be mitigated by other opportunities to fish for the species, as numerous surrounding streams will continue to provide brook trout fisheries and the 1.5 miles of Bryant Creek downstream of the fish barrier where the brook trout fishery would be unaffected by the proposed project. Any adverse secondary impacts would be long-term and minor.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact social structures and mores of the affected human population.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No cumulative impacts to social structures and mores would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **2. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

The proposed project would be entirely located within the Deerlodge National Forest. National Forest lands provide areas of natural beauty and an abundance of free public recreational opportunities such as fishing, hunting, and hiking. The Bryant Creek drainage and its relatively remote and natural setting would remain a desired public resource, as there are no residences within the drainage and only dispersed camping and other outdoor recreational activities currently occur within the affected area.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant direct impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the affected human population would be expected because of the proposed project. It is not expected the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek or the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in the relocation of people into or out of the affected area. Therefore, no impacts to existing cultural uniqueness and diversity of the affected human population would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. It is not expected this action would result in any relocation of people into or out of the affected area. Therefore, no impacts to the existing cultural uniqueness and diversity of the affected area would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact social structures and mores of the affected human population.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No cumulative impacts to social structures and mores would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **3. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action alternative there would be no change in access to and the quality of recreational activities in the Bryant Creek drainage with the exception of the continued lack of a fishery in the Calvert Mine Pond. Most of the Bryant Creek watershed is located on public lands managed by the USFS and is accessible to year-round recreation opportunities including hiking, biking, driving (passenger vehicle, ATV, snowmobile), fishing, hunting, trapping, and wildlife viewing. Access to these activities would not be changed because of the proposed project. The possibility of catching or otherwise enjoying the existence of WCT in Bryant Creek would likely be lost in the next 5-10 years because the species would be outcompeted and ultimately eliminated by brook trout.

### **Direct Impacts**

## **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. There would be a temporary loss of angling opportunity in Bryant Creek for a period of time to enable WCT repopulate the stream. Bryant Creek is accessible to the public and lies mostly on public lands administered by the USFS. The lower reaches of Bryant Creek downstream of the project area are on private property where access is gained only through landowner permission. Once WCT are established and reproducing, it would be expected they would provide the same or improved angling opportunities as the existing non-native brook trout fishery provides today. It should be noted that Bryant Creek is small and does not receive much angling pressure. To mitigate potential impacts anglers would have the opportunity to fish in the many adjacent streams and/or downstream of the fish barrier where angling opportunities will remain unchanged. Multiple streams of similar size, and with similar fisheries to the existing Bryant Creek fishery, exist within 10 miles of Bryant Creek. These streams provide ample opportunities to angle for brook trout in a small stream. Therefore, any impacts would be short-term and negligible.

Access to the Bryant Creek drainage would be restricted during and for a period of 2-4 days after rotenone treatment to prevent human exposure to rotenone (see below). This would include closing the road accessing the Bryant Creek drainage. Access restrictions would impact those wishing to recreate in the area during the few days of the treatment. Limited primitive camping opportunities exist upstream of the fish barrier and a well-used trailhead exists at the end of the Bryant Creek Road which accesses several trails and mountain lakes in the affected area. Such impacts would be mitigated by timing the project such that affected roads are not closed during popular recreation time such as holidays and weekends and maintaining access to adjacent drainages that provide similar recreational opportunities during the 5 days of the treatment each year, until project objectives are achieved.

## **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. A new WCT fishery would be created in the nearby Calvert Mine Pond. The new fishery would increase recreational opportunities in the Bryant Creek drainage. It would also mitigate the lack of a fishery in Bryant Creek while WCT repopulate the stream. Therefore, any direct impacts would be short-term, minor and adverse and long-term, minor, and beneficial.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. People who recreate on Bryant Creek may view the loss of the existing and invasive brook trout fishery as an adverse impact as brook trout, as brook trout have been present in Bryant Creek for over a century. However, the long-term goal for WCT conservation in Montana is to restore secure conservation populations of WCT to 20% of their historic tributary distribution east of the Continental Divide (Upper Missouri River Basin upstream from and including the Judith River; FWP 2019). Mainstem rivers, such as the Big Hole River, support important non-native recreation fisheries (i.e. brown, brook, and rainbow trout) and are not part of this conservation goal. FWP recognizes the value of non-native trout fisheries and would continue to manage 80% of the streams in the upper Missouri River for non-native fish such as brook, rainbow, and brown trout. In the Big Hole River drainage, WCT historically occupied approximately 1,749 miles of streams and rivers. Today there are a total of 47 remaining WCT populations (including slightly (>90%) hybridized WCT) in small headwater tributaries which occupy just over 100 miles of stream (~ 6% of their historic range). Of these 47 WCT populations, nearly 70% are at



risk due to competition and hybridization with non-native fish. Data collected from streams in the Big Hole drainage over the past 15 years indicate that many of the WCT populations in the drainage have dramatically declined or have been extirpated (Olsen 2010; Olsen 2016; Olsen 2020). Projects that restore WCT, such as that proposed for Bryant Creek, are necessary to ensure the continued survival of the species, conserve remaining genetic diversity and meet statutory obligations to prevent listing under the ESA. Therefore, any secondary impacts would be short-term, adverse and negligible and long-term, beneficial, and moderate.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Initial and ongoing stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would create a WCT fishery where none existed previously, thereby increasing local fishing opportunities. Any impacts would be long-term, minor and beneficial.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatments are unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no additional cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact social structures and mores of the affected human population.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No cumulative impacts to access and quality of recreational and wilderness activities would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **4. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

All of the land within the proposed project area are within the Deerlodge National Forest, which are not subject to any local or state taxes.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project does not involve the acquisition of land or property, production of any products, or displacement of any existing businesses. However, the proposed project would be expected to increase state and local tax revenues from the sale of fuel, supplies and/or equipment necessary to complete the

proposed project. Any direct impacts would be short-term and negligible, lasting only as long as the proposed project.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project does not involve the acquisition of land or property, production of any products, or displacement of any existing businesses. However, some local businesses rely largely on recreation as a staple source of income and many people visiting the area to recreate currently seek opportunities to fish for Montana's native WCT. The proposed project would, in part, further the ongoing objective to conserve native WCT and would create a new WCT fishery in Calvert Mine Pond for the enjoyment of current and future fishing recreation. Any secondary impacts to the local and state tax base and tax revenue would be long-term, beneficial, and minor.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact local and state tax base and tax revenues.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. The same potential impacts would be expected; therefore, any cumulative impacts would be consistent with the proposed action and negligible.

## **5. Industrial, Commercial, and Agricultural Activities and Production**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

No industrial or commercial activities currently occur within the Bryant Creek watershed. Timber harvest activities do occur on USFS-owned lands. However, there are no active timber sales in the area affected by the proposed project and the 2021 fires effectively eliminated such potential in the near-term, until the affected forest has regenerated. Significant amounts of timber were removed to create fire lines during 2021 fire suppression efforts.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. It is not expected the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any direct impact to commercial, industrial, or agricultural activities and production. Therefore, no direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. It is not expected the elimination of brook trout to protect native WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek nor the stocking of WCT in Calvert Mine Pond would result in any impact to commercial, industrial, or agricultural activities and production, including any future timber harvest and sales. Therefore, no secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact social structures and mores of the affected human population. When combined with other WCT conservation projects beneficial impacts on agricultural activities would be expected as a result of the proposed action. Many streams located on the National Forest, which also support existing WCT populations, have stipulations regarding grazing and logging to specifically protect WCT from potential adverse impacts associated with such activities. As WCT are conserved through projects such as the Bryant Creek WCT restoration project, these regulations could become obsolete and ultimately removed. Currently non-native fish pose the greatest risk to WCT conservation, not grazing or logging. Any impacts would be long-term, beneficial, and moderate.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No cumulative impacts would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **6. Human Health and Safety**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative.**

There are no known human health or safety concerns within the Bryant Creek drainage. Bryant Creek is relatively pristine watershed. Abandoned mines are often associated with elevated levels of harmful

substances such as metals or other mine waters. However, this is not the case at the Calvert Mine where both the mine tailings and the pit which has filled with groundwater pose no known human health concerns.

## Direct Impacts

### Bryant Creek

No significant direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The primary means of protecting human health from the potential impacts of rotenone application are to follow the label requirements. These include public entry restrictions into a treatment area and preventing consumption of rotenone killed fish. Applicators of rotenone face the highest probability of being exposed to rotenone. Their safety would be protected by the use of label-required PPE including gloves, waders, eye protection and a paper respirator. The EPA (2007) conducted an analysis of the human health risks for rotenone and concluded it has a high acute toxicity in its concentrated form for both oral and inhalation routes but has a low acute toxicity for dermal route of exposure. However, when diluted with water at concentrations proposed for the treatment of Bryant Creek, no adverse impacts to human health and safety would be expected. Rotenone is not an eye or skin irritant nor a skin sensitizer. The EPA concluded there is a low risk for human chronic risk from exposure to rotenone treated water based on four principal reasons: first, the rapid natural degradation of rotenone, second, using active detoxification measures by applicators such as potassium permanganate, third, properly following piscicide labels and the extra precautions stated in this document and finally, proper signing, public notification or area closures which limit public exposure to rotenone treated water.

Rotenone is a naturally occurring substance derived from tropical plants in the bean family such as the jewel vine *Derris spp.* and lacepod *Lonchocarpus spp.* that are found in Australia, southern Asia, and South America. Rotenone has been used by native people for centuries to capture fish for food in areas where these plants are naturally found. In their description of how South American Indians prepare and apply Timbó, a rotenone parent plant, Teixeira, et al. (1984) reported that the Indians extensively handled the plants during a mastication process, and then swam in lagoons to distribute the plant pulp. No harmful effects were reported. Rotenone has also been extensively used as household insecticide and was commercially available in a powder form.

Acute exposure estimates for drinking water considered surface water because rotenone is only applied directly to surface water and is not expected to reach groundwater. The estimated drinking water concentration (EDWC) used in dietary exposure estimates was 200 ppb, the solubility limit of rotenone. The drinking water risk assessment is conservative because it assumes water is consumed immediately after treatment with no degradation and no water treatment prior to consumption. Acute dietary exposure estimates result in dietary risk below the EPA's level of concern. Generally, EPA describes concerns when risk estimates exceed 100% of the acute population adjusted dose (aPAD). The exposure for the "females 13-49 years old" subgroup (0.1117 mg/kg/day) utilized 74% of the aPAD (0.015 mg/kg/day) at the 95th percentile (see Table 5). It is appropriate to consider the 95th percentile because the analysis is deterministic and unrefined. Measures implemented will further minimize potential dietary exposure. Further, the concentration proposed for application into Bryant Creek is 50 ppb and not 200ppb.

Regarding potential recreational exposure, the EPA concludes no risk to adults who enter treated water following the application by dermal and incidental ingestion but requires a waiting period of 3 days after a treatment before toddlers be allowed to swim in treated water. The aggregate risk to human health from food, water, and swimming does not exceed the EPA level of concern (EPA 2007). To reduce or

eliminate any potential risk to human health, public exposure to rotenone treated water would be eliminated to the extent possible. To reduce the potential for exposure of the public during the proposed use of rotenone to restore WCT, areas treated with rotenone would be closed to public access during its application according to the product label specifications. Signs would be placed at access points informing the public of the closure and the presence rotenone treated waters. Also, during application, personnel would be onsite to inform the public and escort them from the treatment area should they enter. Rotenone treated waters would be contained to the proposed treatment areas by adding potassium permanganate to the stream at the existing fish barrier, which would neutralize any remaining rotenone before leaving the project area. The efficacy of the neutralization would be monitored using fish (the most sensitive species to the chemical) and a handheld meter. Therefore, the potential for public exposure to rotenone treated waters is minimal and no direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

Rotenoloids are common degradation products found in the parent plant material used to make piscicidal forms of rotenone. The EPA (2007) concluded these degradation products are no more toxic than the active ingredient. Fisher (2007) conducted an analysis of the inert constituent ingredients found in the rotenone formulation of CFT Legumine (5% rotenone) for the California Department of Fish and Game. These inert ingredients are principally found in the emulsifying agent Fennodefo99 which helps make the generally insoluble rotenone more soluble in water. The constituents were considered because of their known hazard status and not because of their concentrations in the Legumine formulation. Solvents such as xylene, trichloroethylene (TCE) and tetrachloroethylene are residue left over from the process of extracting rotenone from the root and can be found in some lots of CFT Legumine. However, inconsistent detectability and low occurrence in other formulations that used the same extraction process were below the levels for human health and ecological risk. Solvents such as toluene, n-butylbenzene, 1,2,4 trimethylbenzene and naphthalene are present in Legumine, and when used in other applications can be an inhalation risk. However, because of their low concentrations in this formulation, the human health risk is low.

The remaining constituents, the fatty acid esters, resin acids, glycols, substituted benzenes, and 1-hexanol were likewise present but either analyzed, calculated or estimated to be below the human health risk levels when used in a typical fish eradication project. Methyl pyrrolidone is also found in Legumine. It is known to have solvency properties and is used to dissolve a wide range of compounds including resins (rotenone). Analysis of Methyl pyrrolidone in Legumine showed it represents about 9% of the formulation (Fisher 2007). Fisher 2007 concluded, "None of the constituents identified are considered persistent in the environment nor will they bioaccumulate. The trace benzenes identified in the solvent mixture of CFT Legumine™ will exhibit limited volatility and will rapidly degrade through photolytic and biological degradation mechanisms. The PEGs are highly soluble, have very low volatility, and are rapidly biodegraded within a matter of days. The fatty acids in the fatty acid ester mixture (Fennodefo99™) do not exhibit significant volatility, are virtually insoluble, and are readily biodegraded, although likely over a slightly longer period of time than the PEGs in the mixture. None of the new compounds identified exhibit persistence or are known to bioaccumulate. Under conditions that would favor groundwater exchange the highly soluble PEGs could feasibly transmit to groundwater, but the concentrations in the reservoir, and the rapid biodegradation of these constituents makes this scenario extremely unlikely. Based upon a review of the physical chemistry of the chemicals identified, FWP concludes they are rapidly biodegraded, hydrolyzed and/or otherwise photolytically oxidized; therefore, the affected chemicals pose no additional risk to human health or ecological receptors from those identified in the earlier analysis. None of the constituents identified appear to be at concentrations that

suggest human health risks through exposure to water, or ingestion exposure scenarios, and no relevant regulatory criteria are exceeded in estimated exposure concentrations...”

One study, in which rats were injected with rotenone for a period of weeks, reported finding lesions characteristic of Parkinson’s disease (Betarbet et al. 2000). However, the relevance of the results to the use of rotenone as a piscicide have been challenged based upon the following dissimilarities between the experimental methodology used and fisheries related applications: (1) the continuous intravenous injection method used to treat the rats leads to “continuously high levels of the compound in the blood,” unlike field applications where 1) the oral route is the most likely method of exposure, 2) a much lower dose is used and 3) potential exposure to rotenone is limited to a matter of days because of the rapid breakdown of the rotenone following application. Further, dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) was used to enhance tissue penetration in the laboratory experiment (normal routes of exposure actually slow introduction of chemicals into the bloodstream), no such chemicals enhancing tissue penetration are present in the rotenone formulation proposed for use in this treatment. Similar studies (Marking 1988) have found no Parkinson’s-like results. Extensive research has demonstrated that rotenone does not cause birth defects (HRI 1982), gene mutations (Van Geothem et al. 1981; BRL 1982) or cancer (Marking 1988). Rotenone was found to have no direct role in fetal development of rats that were fed high concentrations of rotenone. Spencer and Sing (1982) reported that rats that were fed diets laced with 10-1,000 ppm rotenone over a 10 day period did not suffer any reproductive dysfunction. Typical concentrations of actual rotenone used in fishery management range from 1-2 ppm and are far below that administered during most toxicology studies.

A study linked the use of rotenone and paraquat with the development of Parkinson’s disease (PD) in humans later in life (Tanner et al. 2011). The after-the-fact study included mostly farmers from 2 states within the United States who presumably used rotenone for terrestrial application to crops and/or livestock. Rotenone is no longer used for agricultural applications and is only used in aquatic applications as a piscicide. The results of epidemiological studies of pesticide exposure, such as this one have been highly variable (Guenther et al. 2011). Studies have found no correlations between pesticide exposure and PD (e.g., Jiménez-Jiménez 1992; Hertzman 1994; Engel et al. 2001; Firestone et al. 2010), some have found correlations between pesticide exposure and PD (e.g., Hubble et al. 1993; Lai et al. 2002; Tanner et al. 2011) and some have found it difficult to determine which pesticide or pesticide class is implicated if associations with PD occur (e.g., Engel et al. 2001; Tanner et al. 2009). Recently, epidemiological studies linking pesticide exposure to PD have been criticized due to the high variation among study results, generic categorization of pesticide exposure scenarios, questionnaire subjectivity, and the difficulty in evaluating the causal factors in the complex disease of PD, which may have multiple causal factors (age, genetics, environment) (Raffaele et al. 2011). A specific concern is the inability to assess the degree of exposure to certain chemicals, including rotenone, particularly the concentration of the chemical, frequency of use, application (e.g., agricultural, insect removal from pets), and exposure routes (Raffaele et al. 2011). No information is given in the Tanner et al. (2011) study about the formulation of rotenone used (powder or liquid) or the frequency or dose farmers were exposed to during their careers. There is also no information given about the personal protective equipment used or any information about other pesticides farmers were exposed to during the period of the study. Without information on how much rotenone individuals were exposed to and for how long, it is difficult to evaluate the potential risk to humans of developing Parkinson’s disease from aquatic applications of rotenone products from this study.

The state of Arizona conducted an exhaustive review of the risks to human health of rotenone use as a piscicide (Guenther et al. 2011). They concluded: “To date, there are no published studies that conclusively link exposure to rotenone and the development of clinically diagnosed PD. Some



correlation studies have found a higher incidence of PD with exposure to pesticides among other factors, and some have not. It is very important to note that in case-control correlation studies, causal relationships cannot be assumed and some associations identified in odds-ratio analyses may be chance associations. Only one study (Tanner et al. 2011) found an association between rotenone and paraquat use and PD in agricultural workers, primarily farmers. However, there are substantial differences between the methods of application, formulation, and doses of rotenone used in agriculture and residential settings compared with aquatic use as a piscicide, and the agricultural workers interviewed were also exposed to many other pesticides during their careers. Through the EPA reregistration process of rotenone, occupational exposure risk is minimized by new requirements that state handlers may only apply rotenone at less than the maximum treatment concentrations (200 ppb), the development of engineering controls to some of the rotenone dispensing equipment and requiring handlers to wear specific PPE.”

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. A study of the water quality and other biotic and abiotic conditions in the Calvert Mine Pond indicates that overall, “the Calvert Lake is a good example of a pit lake formed from metal mining that has excellent water quality, which is a result of its favorable geology (lack of sulfide minerals) and flow through hydrology” (Gammons et al. 2013). The study found that, “the water quality information obtained in this study shows no obvious problems with respect to the ability of the Calvert pit lake to support aquatic life,” and that “from a water-quality point of view, this lake can support trout.” Given the good water quality in the pond, there are no anticipated direct or secondary impacts on human health of those who catch and consume stocked WCT from the Calvert Mine Pond.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Based on the above discussion of direct impacts (and secondary impacts), no adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected. FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact local and state tax base and tax revenues.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No cumulative impacts would be

expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **7. Quantity and Distribution of Employment**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

There are no known jobs that are directly related to the Bryant Creek drainage. USGS personnel manage the land resources in the drainage and FWP manages the fish and wildlife resources. Existing staff for both agencies cover these management responsibilities.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse direct impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project would utilize existing FWP staff to conduct activities; therefore, no impacts to the quantity and distribution of employment in the area affected by the proposed project would be expected because of the proposed project.

### **Secondary Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project may modify ongoing FWP activities in the affected area to ensure the established WCT populations in both the affected section of Bryant Creek and within Calvert Mine Pond remain intact and viable. Any impacts would be long-term, consistent with existing impacts (FWP staff duties) and negligible.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects that would impact geology in the Bryant Creek drainage. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population from the affected stretch of Bryant Creek, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no additional cumulative impacts would be expected.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. Therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **8. Density and Distribution of Human Population and Housing**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

The entirety of the proposed project would take place in the Deerlodge National Forest. There are no houses within the National Forest, including the Bryant Creek drainage and Calvert Mine Pond.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant direct adverse impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project would use existing FWP personnel and would not otherwise require or result in the movement of existing or new population into or out of the affected area. Therefore, no direct impacts to the density and distribution of population and housing would be expected because of the proposed project.

### **Secondary Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project would use existing government personnel and would not otherwise require or result in the movement of existing or new population into or out of the affected area. Therefore, no secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects that would impact the density and distribution of the human population and housing in the affected area. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population from the affected stretch of Bryant Creek, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

#### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **9. Demands for Government Services**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative.**

The USFS manages the land and aquatic habitat in the affected section of the Bryant Creek drainage. FWP manages the wildlife and fisheries resources of the drainage. The loss of the Bryant Creek WCT population and additional WCT across Montana could result in the species being listed as threatened or endangered. WCT have been petitioned for listing in the past and if conservation actions are not performed, they could qualify for listing in the future. A listed species requires significantly more

government resources to manage than a species that is under state jurisdiction.

## **Direct Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant direct adverse impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Under the proposed project, primarily government personnel (FWP, USFS, and BLM) would complete the WCT restoration project in Bryant Creek. The proposed project would require about 5 days of work for between 8 and 12 employees and, once the removal of brook trout is complete and the affected WCT population has been re-established, no additional government services would be required because the WCT population would be expected to fill the habitat and become self-sustaining without government assistance.

## **Secondary Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project may modify ongoing FWP activities in the affected area to ensure the established WCT populations in both the affected section of Bryant Creek and within Calvert Mine Pond remain intact and viable. Modified activities would include periodic monitoring of the restored WCT population, including genetic testing. Any secondary impacts would be long-term and minor because the existing brook trout fishery would also be monitored with roughly the same frequency and effort.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The introduction of WCT to Calvert Mine Pond would require secondary follow-up monitoring to determine if the fish survived and if the stocking rate was appropriate to produce a quality fishery. Additionally, if successful, FWP would continue to stock the pond every 4 years into the future. Any secondary impacts would be long-term, consistent with existing impacts (FWP staff duties) and negligible.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects that would impact the density and distribution of the human population and housing in the affected area. FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population from the affected stretch of Bryant Creek, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

### **Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts would be expected

because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

## **10. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals**

### **Existing Environment/No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, it is likely that the WCT in Bryant Creek would be extirpated within the next 5-10 years. FWP's is obligated to keep species from warranting listing under the ESA. FWP also manages WCT according to the Westslope Cutthroat Trout Conservation Strategy for the Missouri River Headwaters of Southwest Montana (Jaeger et al. 2022), Statewide Fisheries Management Program and Guide (MFWP 2019) and the Memorandum of Understanding and Conservation Agreement for Westslope Cutthroat Trout and Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout in Montana (MFWP 2007). Bryant Creek contains a non-hybridized population of WCT that is in jeopardy and management activities are adjusted to reduce potential impacts to the species.

There are no known environmental plans or goals that include the Calvert Mine Pond.

### **Direct Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant direct adverse impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed action would adhere to existing state policy, guidelines and strategies (MFWP 2007, MFWP 2019, Jaeger et al. 2022). Therefore, any impacts would be long-term, beneficial, and minor to moderate.

### **Secondary Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek and Calvert Mine Pond**

No significant adverse secondary impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project would preserve a conservation population of WCT in the affected section of Bryant Creek and add a new WCT fishery in Calvert Mine Pond, thereby enhancing fishing opportunities for current and future generations. Further, the proposed action would adhere to existing state policy, guidelines and strategies (MFWP 2007, MFWP 2019, Jaeger et al. 2022), thereby furthering FWP's objectives related to long-term management of WCT. Any secondary impacts would be long-term, beneficial, and moderate.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

#### **Bryant Creek**

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. The proposed project would benefit WCT conservation efforts, which would help FWP meet its obligation to prevent species from becoming listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA. The long-term goal for WCT conservation is to restore secure conservation populations of WCT to 20% of their historic tributary distribution east of the Continental Divide (Upper Missouri River Basin upstream from and including the Judith River; FWP 2019). Once the proposed project is completed and combined with similar projects performed in the Big Hole drainage, WCT will occupy 209 miles of stream or nearly 2/3 of the 20% restoration goal. Collectively, WCT conservation projects like the one proposed for Bryant Creek are intended to secure a small amount of the overall fish-bearing habitat for WCT to ensure the

species long-term, self-sustaining persistence while managing the vast majority of habitat (80%) for non-native fish like brook trout, rainbow trout, and brown trout

FWP has not previously treated the affected section of Bryant Creek with rotenone. However, if the initial rotenone treatment is unsuccessful in eradicating the invasive brook trout population, additional treatment may be deemed necessary. If additional treatment with rotenone is deemed necessary, no cumulative impacts would be expected.

#### Calvert Mine Pond

No significant adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project. Calvert Mine Pond is an abandoned open pit tungsten mine. FWP is unaware of any past or present related state projects affecting Calvert Mine Pond and the proposed stocking of WCT to create a new fishery. However, because WCT would not be expected to naturally reproduce in the pond, additional stocking of WCT would occur on an every-4-year basis to maintain the fishery. No impacts would be expected because of ongoing WCT stocking activities; therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts would be expected because of the proposed project.

FWP is unaware of any other past, present, or future related state projects that would impact aesthetics of the affected area. Ultimately, restoration of WCT would contribute to cumulative restoration of WCT and attainment of goals described in existing state policy, guidelines and strategies (MFWP 2007, MFWP 2019, Jaeger et al. 2022) and reduce the likelihood of ESA listing.

## X. Determining the Significance of Impacts

If the EA identifies impacts associated with the proposed action FWP must determine the significance of the impacts. This determination forms the basis for FWP's decision as to whether it is necessary to prepare an environmental impact statement. FWP considered the criteria identified in **Table 3** below to determine the significance of each impact on the quality of the physical and human environment. ARM 12.2.431.

The significance determination is made by giving weight to these criteria in their totality. For example, impacts identified as moderate or major in severity may not be significant if the duration is short-term. However, moderate or major impacts of short-term duration may be significant if the quantity and quality of the resource is limited and/or the resource is unique or fragile. Further, moderate or major impacts to a resource may not be significant if the quantity of that resource is high or the quality of the resource is not unique or fragile.

**Table 3: Determining the Significance of Impacts**

Criteria Used to Determine Significance	
1	<p>The <b>severity, duration, geographic extent, and frequency</b> of the occurrence of the impact</p> <p><b>“Severity”</b> describes the density of the potential impact, while <b>“extent”</b> describes the area where the impact will likely occur, e.g., a project may propagate ten noxious weeds on a surface area of 1 square foot. Here, the impact may be high in severity, but over a low extent. In contrast, if ten noxious weeds were distributed over ten acres, there may be low severity over a larger extent.</p> <p><b>“Duration”</b> describes the time period during which an impact may occur, while <b>“frequency”</b> describes how often the impact may occur, e.g., an operation that uses lights to mine at night may have frequent lighting impacts during one season (duration).</p>

2	The probability that the impact will occur if the proposed project occurs; or conversely, reasonable assurance in keeping with the potential severity of an impact that the impact will not occur
3	Growth-inducing or growth-inhibiting aspects of the impact, including the relationship or contribution of the impact to cumulative impacts
4	The quantity and quality of each environmental resource or value that would be affected, including the uniqueness and fragility of those resources and values
5	The importance to the state and to society of each environmental resource or value that would be affected
6	Any precedent that would be set as a result of an impact of the proposed project that would commit FWP to future actions with significant impacts or a decision in principle about such future actions
7	Potential conflict with local, state, or federal laws, requirements, or formal plans

## XI. Private Property Impact Analysis (Takings)

The 54<sup>th</sup> Montana Legislature enacted the Private Property Assessment Act, now found at § 2-10-101. The intent was to establish an orderly and consistent process by which state agencies evaluate their proposed projects 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 projects pertaining to land or water management or to some other environmental matter that, if adopted and enforced without due process of law and just 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 agencies to assess the impact of a proposed agency project 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 project has taking or damaging implications, the agency must prepare an impact assessment in accordance with Section 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act.

**Table 4: Private Property Assessment Act (Taking and Damaging Assessment)**

PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESMENT CHECKLIST			
Does the Proposed Action Have Takings Implications under the PPAA?	Question #	Yes	No
Does the project pertain to land or water management or environmental regulations affecting private property or water rights?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action result in either a permanent or an indefinite physical occupation of private property?	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? (If answer is NO, skip questions 4a and 4b and continue with question 5.)	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interest?	4a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property?	4b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership?	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the action have a severe impact of the value of the property?	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public general? (If the answer is NO, skip questions 7a-7c.)	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?	7a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded?	7b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the 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?	7c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Does the proposed action result in taking or damaging implications?</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Taking or damaging implications exist if <b>YES</b> 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 <b>NO</b> is checked in response to question 4a or 4b.			
If taking or damaging implications exist, the agency must comply with MCA § 2-10-105 of the PPAA, 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.			
<b>Alternatives:</b> The analysis under the Private Property Assessment Act, §§ 2-10-101-112, MCA, indicates no impact. FWP does not plan to impose conditions that would restrict the regulated person's use of private property to constitute a taking.			

## XII. Public Participation

### Scoping

Because FWP determined the proposed action will result in limited environmental impact, and little public interest has been expressed, FWP determined the proposed project did not meet the criteria for a public scoping meeting. Therefore, a public scoping meeting was not held for the proposed action. Scoping was held with the landowner (Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest) and other project partners. Several strategies were used to inform the public about and solicit comments on the Proposed Action. These strategies included:

- Press release
- Legal notice
- Distribution of a scoping letter
- Public open house at the Wise River Community Center on Thursday, July 6, 2023 at 7:00PM in Wise River.

For the proposed project, scoping efforts included queries to the following affected agencies:

- Montana Natural Heritage Program
- US Department of the Interior
  - Fish and Wildlife Service
  - Bureau of Land Management
- US Department of Agriculture
  - Forest Service

**Table 5: Public Notice – Newspaper/Periodical and Date Published**

Newspaper / Periodical	Date(s) Public Notice Issued
TBD	TBD



Public notice announces availability of the Draft EA for public review, summarizes the proposed project, identifies the time-period available for public comment, and provides direction for submitting comments.

- **Duration of Public Comment Period:** The public comment period begins on the date of publication of legal notice in area newspapers (see above). Written or e-mailed comments will be accepted until 5:00 p.m., Mountain Time, on the last day of public comment, as listed below:

**Length of Public Comment Period:** 30 days

**Public Comment Period Begins:** June 22, 2023

**Public Comment Period Ends:** 5:00 p.m. July 22, 2023

Comments must be addressed to the FWP contact listed below.

- **Where to Mail or Email Comments on the Draft EA:**

**Name:** Jim Olsen

**Email:** [jjimolsen@mt.gov](mailto:jjimolsen@mt.gov)

**Mailing Address:**

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

c/o Bryant Creek WCT Restoration EA comments

1820 Meadowlark Ln.

Butte, MT 59701

#### **Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis**

<b>NO</b> further analysis is needed for the proposed action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FWP must conduct <b>EIS</b> level review for the proposed action	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **XIII. EA Preparation and Review**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>EA prepared by:</b>	Jim Olsen	Regional Fisheries Biologist
<b>EA reviewed by:</b>	Matt Jaeger Eric Merchant	Regional Native Fish Program Manager MEPA Coordinator

## Appendix A: References

- AFS (American Fisheries Society). 2002. Rotenone stewardship program, fish management chemicals subcommittee. [www.fisheries.org/rotenone/](http://www.fisheries.org/rotenone/).
- Anderson, R.S. 1970. Effects of rotenone on zooplankton communities and a study of their recovery patterns in two mountain lakes in Alberta. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada*. Vol 27, no. 8, 1335-1355
- Betarbet, R., T.B. Sherer, G. MacKenzie, M. Garcia-Osuna, A.V. Panov, and T. Greenamyre. 2000. Chronic systemic pesticide exposure reproduces features of Parkinson's disease. *Nature Neuroscience* 3 (12): 1301-1306.
- Big Hole Watershed Committee. 2013. Big Hole River, Montana Watershed Restoration Plan Part II: Middle & Lower Big Hole Watershed. Big Hole Watershed Committee. PO Box 21, Divide, Montana 59727. e-mail: [info@bhwc.org](mailto:info@bhwc.org), website: [bhwc.org](http://bhwc.org).
- Bosworth, D. N., K. B. Clarke and J. Baughman. 2006. Policies and Guidelines for Fish and Wildlife Management in National Forest and Bureau of Land Management Wilderness.
- BPA (Bonneville Power Administration) 2004. South Fork Flathead watershed westslope cutthroat trout conservation project. Draft environmental impact statement. DOE/EIS 0353. Portland, OR.
- Bradbury, A. 1986. Rotenone and trout stocking: a literature review with special reference to Washington Department of Game's lake rehabilitation program. Fisheries management report 86-2. Washington Department of Game.
- BRL (Biotech Research Laboratories). 1982. Analytical studies for detection of chromosomal aberrations in fruit flies, rats, mice, and horse bean. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS Study 14-16-0009-80-54). National fishery research Laboratory, La Crosse, Wisconsin.
- Carim, K.J., N.J. Bean, J.M. Connor, W.P. Baker, M. Jaeger, M.P. Ruggles, K.S. McKelvey, T.W. Franklin, M.K. Young, and M.K. Schwartz. 2020. Environmental DNA sampling informs fish eradication efforts: Case studies and lessons learned. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 40(2): 488-508.
- CDFG (California Department of Fish and Game), 1994. Rotenone use for fisheries management, July 1994, final programmatic environmental impact report. State of California Department of Fish and Game.
- Chandler, J.H. and L.L. Marking. 1982. Toxicity of rotenone to selected aquatic invertebrates and frog larvae. *The progressive fish culturist* 44(2) 78-80.
- Clancey, P.T, B.B. Shepard, C.G. Kruse, S.A. Barndt, L. Nelson, B.C. Roberts and R.B. Turner. 2019. Collaboration, Commitment, and Adaptive Learning Enable Eradication of Nonnative Trout and Establishment of Native Westslope Cutthroat Trout into One-Hundred Kilometers of Cherry Creek, a Tributary to the Madison River, Montana. Pages 589-647 *in* D.C. Dauwalter, T.W. Birdsong, and G.P. Garrett, editors. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 91, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Cook, S.F. and R.L. Moore. 1969. The effects of a rotenone treatment on the insect fauna of a California stream. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 83 (3):539-544.
- Cushing, C.E. and J.R. Olive. 1956. Effects of toxaphene and rotenone upon the macroscopic bottom fauna of two northern Colorado reservoirs. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 86:294-301.
- Cutkomp, L.K. 1943. Toxicity of rotenone to animals: a review and comparison of responses shown by various species of insects, fishes, birds, mammals, etc. *Soap and Sanitary Chemicals* 19(10): 107-123.
- Dawson, V.K., W.H. Gingerich, R.A. Davis, and P.A. Gilderhus. 1991. Rotenone persistence in freshwater ponds: effects of

- temperature and sediment adsorption. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 11:226-231.
- Engel, L.S., H. Checkoway, M. C. Keifer, N. S. Seixas, W. T. Longstreth Jr., K. C. Scott, K. Hudnell, W. K. Anger, and R. Camicioli. 2001. Parkinsonism and occupational exposure to pesticides. *Occupational Environmental Medicine* 58:582-589.
- Engstrom-Heg, R. 1971. Direct measure of potassium permanganate demand and residual potassium permanganate. *New York Fish and Game Journal* vol. 18 no. 2:117-122.
- Engstrom-Heg, R. 1972. Kinetics of rotenone-potassium permanganate reactions as applied to the protection of trout streams. *New York Fish and Game Journal* vol. 19 no. 1:47-58.
- Engstrom-Heg, R. 1976. Potassium permanganate demand of a stream bottom. *New York Fish and Game Journal* vol. 23 no. 2:155-159.
- Engstrom-Heg, R, R.T. Colesante, and E. Silco. 1978. Rotenone Tolerances of Stream-Bottom Insects. *New York Fish and Game Journal* 25 (1):31-41.
- EPA, 2007. United States Environmental Protection Agency, prevention, pesticides and toxic substances (7508P). EPA 738-R-07-005. Reregistration Eligibility Decision for Rotenone, List A Case No. 0255.
- Feuerstein, C. A. 2022. The Genetic and Demographic Outcomes of Mixed-Source Reintroductions of Westslope Cutthroat Trout in Montana. Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 11871. <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/11871>.
- Finlayson, B., W. Somer, and M. R. Vinson. 2010. Rotenone toxicity to rainbow trout and several mountain stream insects. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 30:102-111.
- Finlayson, B.J., R.A. Schnick, R.L. Caiteux, L. DeMong, W.D. Horton, W. McClay, C.W. Thompson, and G.J. Tichacek. 2000. Rotenone Use in Fisheries Management: Administrative and Technical Guidelines Manual. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Firestone, J.A., J.I. Lundin, K.M. Powers, T. Smith-Weller, G.M. Franklin, P.D. Swanson, W.T. Longstreth Jr., and H. Checkoway. 2010. Occupational factors and risk of Parkinson's disease: a population-based case-control study. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 53:217-223.
- Fisher, J.P. 2007. Screening level risk analysis of previously unidentified rotenone formulation constituents associated with the treatment of Lake Davis. *for California Department of Fish and Game*. Environ International Corporation, Seattle.
- FWP. 2019. Montana Statewide Fisheries Management Program and Guide. Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks, Helena, MT. <https://fwp.mt.gov/conservation/fisheries-management/statewide-fisheries-management>.
- Gilderhus, P.A., J.L. Allen, and V.K. Dawson. 1986. Persistence of rotenone in ponds at different temperatures. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*. 6: 129-130.
- Grisak, G. 2003. South Fork Flathead watershed westslope cutthroat trout conservation program. Specialist report for environmental impact statement. FWP, Kalispell.
- Grisak, G.G., D. R. Skaar, G. L. Michael, M.E. Schnee and B.L. Marotz. 2007. Toxicity of Fintrol (antimycin) and Prenfish (rotenone) to three amphibian species. *Intermountain Journal of Sciences*. Vol. 13, No.1:1-8.
- Guenther, H., M. Schaefer and 19 others. 2011. Rotenone Review Advisory Committee Final Report and Recommendations to the Arizona Game and Fish Department. [http://www.azgfd.gov/h\\_f/documents/Rotenone\\_Review\\_Advisory\\_Committee\\_Final\\_Report\\_12\\_31\\_2011.pdf](http://www.azgfd.gov/h_f/documents/Rotenone_Review_Advisory_Committee_Final_Report_12_31_2011.pdf).

- Harig, A. L. and K.D. Fausch. 2002. Minimum habitat requirements for establishing translocated cutthroat trout populations. *Ecological Applications* 12:535-551.
- Hertzman, C., M. Wiens, and B. Snow. 1994. A case-control study of Parkinson's disease in a horticultural region of British Columbia. *Movement Disorders* 9(1):69-75.
- Hilderbrand, R.H. and J. L. Kershner. 2000. Conserving inland cutthroat trout in small streams: how much stream is enough? *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 20:513-520.
- Hisata, J.S. 2002. Lake and stream rehabilitation: rotenone use and health risks. Final supplemental environmental impact statement. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia.
- HRI (Hazelton Raltech Laboratories). 1982. Teratology studies with rotenone in rats. Report to U.S. Geological Survey. Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center (USFWS Study 81-178). La Crosse, Wisconsin.
- Houf, L.J. and R.S. Campbell. 1977. Effects of antimycin a and rotenone on macrobenthos in ponds. Investigations in fish control number 80. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fish Control Laboratory, LaCrosse.
- Hubble, J.P., T. Cao, R.E.S. Hassanein, J.S. Neuberger, and W.C. Koller. 1993. Risk factors for Parkinson's disease. *Neurology* 43:1693-1697.
- Hughey, R.E. 1975. The effects of fish toxicant antimycin A and rotenone on zooplankton communities in ponds. Masters thesis. University of Missouri. Columbia.
- Jiménez-Jiménez, F., D. Mateo, and S. Giménex-Roldán. 1992. Exposure to well water and pesticides in Parkinson's disease: a case-control study in the Madrid area. *Movement Disorders* 7(2):149-152.
- Kiaser J, and R. Richardson. 2000. Decision Notice and Finding of no Significant Impact Anaconda-Pintler Wilderness Management Direction. USDA Forest Service, Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest, Bitterroot National Forest. 420 Barrett St. Dillon, MT 59725.
- Kovach, R.P., R.F. Leary, D.A. Bell, S. Painter, A. Lodmell, and A.R. Whiteley. 2021. Genetic variation in westslope cutthroat trout reveals that widespread genetic rescue is warranted. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 79:936–946.
- Kiser, R.W., J.R. Donaldson, and P.R. Olson. 1963. The effect of rotenone on zooplankton populations in freshwater lakes. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 92(1):17-24.
- Knapp, R.A. and K.R. Matthews. 1998. Eradication of nonnative fish by gill netting from a small mountain lake in California. *Restoration Ecology*, vol. 6, 2:207-213.
- Kulp, M.A. and S. E. Moore. 2000. Multiple Electrofishing Removals for Eliminating Rainbow Trout in a Small Southern Appalachian Stream. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 20:259–266.
- Leary, R. 2014. Genetic testing results letter dated January 27, 2014, Sample # 4557. University of Montana Conservation Genetics Laboratory, Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana 59812.
- Leary, R. 2015. Genetic testing results letter dated February 5, 2015, Sample #4625. University of Montana Conservation Genetics Laboratory, Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana 59812.
- Lai, B.C.L., S.A. Marion, K. Teschke, and J.K.C. Tsui. 2002. Occupational and environmental risk factors for Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism and Related Disorders* 8:297-309.
- Ling, N. 2002: Rotenone, a review of its toxicity and use for fisheries management. New Zealand Department of

- Loeb, H.A. and R. Engstrom-Heg. 1970. Time-dependent changes in toxicity of rotenone dispersions to trout. *Toxicology and applied pharmacology* 17, 605-614.
- Mangum, F. A. & J. L. Madrigal. 1999. Rotenone effects on aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Strawberry River, Utah: a five-year summary. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology* 14: 125–135.
- Marking, L.L., and T.D. Bills. 1976. Toxicity of rotenone to fish in standardized laboratory tests. Investigations in fish control number 72. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fish Control Laboratory, LaCrosse.
- Marking, L.L. 1988. Oral toxicity of rotenone to mammals. Investigations in fish control, technical report 94. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Fisheries Research Center, La Crosse, Wisconsin.
- Matthaei, C.D., Uehlinger, U., Meyer, E.I., Frutiger, A. 1996. Recolonization by benthic invertebrates after experimental disturbance in a Swiss prealpine river *Freshwater Biology* 35 (2):233-248.
- Meronek, T.G., P.M. Bouchard, E.R. Buckner, T.M. Burri, K.K. Demmerly, D.C.Hatleli, R.A.Klumb, S.H. Schmidt and D.W.Coble. 1996. A review of fish control projects. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 16:63-74.
- Mihuc, T.B. and G. W. Minshall. 1995. Trophic generalists vs. trophic specialists: implications for food web dynamics in post-fire streams. *Ecology* 76(8):2361-2372.
- Minshall, G.W. 2003. Responses of stream benthic invertebrates to fire. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 178:155-161.
- Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology. 2017. Geology of Metallic Mineral Deposits, Northern Rockies, Proceedings, USA. <https://mbmg.mtech.edu/pdf-open-files/mbmg685.pdf>
- Montana Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks. 1996. Assessments of methods for removal or suppression of introduced fish in bull trout recovery. Montana bull trout scientific group. *for* Montana bull trout restoration team, Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks, Helena.
- Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks. 2007. Memorandum of understanding and conservation agreement for westslope cutthroat trout and Yellowstone cutthroat trout in Montana. Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks.
- Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks. 2019. Montana Statewide Fisheries Management: Program and Guide-2019-2027. 1420 East Sixth Avenue, Helena, MT 59620. 488 pp.
- Moore, S. E., B. L. Ridley, and G. L. Larson. 1983. Standing crops of brook trout concurrent with removal of rainbow trout from selected streams in Great Smoky Mountains National Park. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 3:72–80.
- ODFW, 2002. Questions and answers about rotenone. *from* Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife web page, Diamond Lake rotenone treatment, [www.dfw.state.or/ODFWhtml/InfoCntrFish/DiamondLake.Rotenone.html](http://www.dfw.state.or/ODFWhtml/InfoCntrFish/DiamondLake.Rotenone.html).
- Olsen, J. R. 2006. Mid Yellowstone Drainage Investigation Report. Project Number F-113. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Billings, MT.
- Olsen, J. R. 2017. Stream Surveys in the Big Hole River Drainage 2010-2017. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Fisheries Division Federal Aid Job Progress Report, Federal Aid Project Number: F-113 April 1, 2011 – April 1, 2017, Butte, MT.
- Olsen, J. R. 2020. Stream Surveys in the Big Hole River Drainage 2017-2020. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Fisheries Division Federal Aid Job Progress Report, Federal Aid Project Number: F-113-R April 1, 2016 – December 31,

2020, Butte, MT.

- Parker, B.R., D.W. Schindler, D.B. Donald, and R.S. Anderson. 2001. The effects of stocking and removal of a nonnative salmonid on the plankton of an alpine lake. *Ecosystems* (2001) 4:334-345.
- Parker, R.O. 1970. Surfacing of dead fish following application of rotenone. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*. 99 4:805-807.
- Prentiss Incorporated. 2007. Product label for CFT Legumine™ fish toxicant, 5% liquid formulation of rotenone. Sandersville, Georgia.
- Raffaele, K.C., S.V. Vulimiri, and T.F. Bateson. 2011. Benefits and barriers to using epidemiology data in environmental risk assessment. *The Open Epidemiology Journal* 4:99-105.
- Rumsey, S., J. Fraley, and J. Cavigli. 1996. Ross and Devine lakes invertebrate results – 1994-1996. File report. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Kalispell.
- Schnee, M.E. 2006. Martin Lakes 1-year, post rotenone treatment report. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Kalispell.
- Schnee, M.E. 2007a. Blue Lake 1-year, post rotenone treatment report. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Kalispell.
- Schnee, M.E. 2007b. Martin Lakes 2-year, post rotenone treatment report. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Kalispell.
- Schnick, R. A. 1974. A review of the literature on the use of rotenone in fisheries. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, LaCrosse, WI.
- Shriver, E.B, and P.D. Murphy. 2007. Utilization of Tiger Muskellunge for Controlling Self-sustaining Populations of Introduced Brook Trout in Mountain Lakes. Draft report. Idaho Fish and Game, Salmon.
- Shetter, D.S. and G.R. Alexander. 1970. Results of predator reduction on brook trout and brown trout in 4.2 miles of the North Branch of the Au Sable River. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 2:312-319.
- SOLO. 2023. A Guide to Soil Quality Monitoring for Long Term Ecosystem Sustainability on Northern Region National Forests. [https://forest.moscowfs.wsu.edu/smp/solo/GeoPath/subsection/beaverhead\\_mtns/M332Ee.html](https://forest.moscowfs.wsu.edu/smp/solo/GeoPath/subsection/beaverhead_mtns/M332Ee.html).
- Bradley B. Shepard, Lee M. Nelson, Mark L. Taper & Alexander V. Zale (2014) Factors Influencing Successful Eradication of Nonnative Brook Trout from Four Small Rocky Mountain Streams Using Electrofishing, *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 34:5, 988-997, DOI: [10.1080/02755947.2014.942042](https://doi.org/10.1080/02755947.2014.942042)
- Shepard, B.B., R. Spoon and L. Nelson. 2001. Westslope cutthroat trout restoration in Muskrat Creek, Boulder River drainage, Montana. Progress report for period 1993 to 2000. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Townsend.
- Skaar, D. 2001. A brief summary of the persistence and toxic effects of rotenone. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Helena.
- Spencer, F. and L.T. Sing. 1982. Reproductive responses to rotenone during decidualized pseudogestation and gestation in rats. *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*. 228: 360-368.
- Tanner, C.M., G.W. Ross, S.A. Jewell, R.A. Hauser, J. Jankovic, S.A. Factor, S. Bressman, A. Deligtisch, C. Marras, K.E. Lyons, G.S. Bhudhikanok, D.F. Roucoux, C. Meng, R.D. Abbott, and J.W. Langston. 2009. Occupation and risk of Parkinsonism. *Arch Neurology* 66(9):1106-1113.
- Tanner, C.M., F. Kamel, W. Ross, J.A. Hoppin, S.M. Goldman, M. Korell, C. Marras, G.S. Bhudhikanok, M. Kasten, A.R. Chade, K. Comyns, M.B. Richards, C. Meng, B. Priestley, H.H. Fernandex, F. Cambi, D.M. Umbach, A. Blair, D.P. Sandler, and J.W. Langston. 2011. Rotenone, paraquat, and Parkinson's disease. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 119(6):866-872.

- Teixeira, J.R.M., A.J. Lapa, C. Souccar, and J.R. Valle. 1984. Timbós: ichthyotoxic plants used by Brazilian Indians. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 10:311-318.
- Thompson, P. D., and F. J. Rahel. 1996. Evaluation of depletion-removal electrofishing of brook trout in small Rocky Mountain streams. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 16:332–339.
- Van Goethem, D, B. Barnhart, and S. Fotopoulos. 1981. Mutagenicity studies on rotenone. Report to U.S. Geological Survey. Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center (USFWS Study 14-16-009-80-076), La Crosse, Wisconsin.
- Wang, S., J.J Hard, and F. Utter. 2002. Salmonid inbreeding: a review. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*. 11:301-319.
- Ware, G.W. 2002. An introduction to insecticides 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. University of Arizona, Department of Entomology, Tuscon. on EXTOWNET. Extension Toxicology Network. Oregon State University web page.
- Wohl, N.E. and R. F. Carline. 1996. Relations among riparian grazing, sediment loads, macroinvertebrates, and fishes in three Pennsylvania streams. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 53:260-266.