DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Kelly Reservoir Illegal Fish Removal 12/20/2023

FWP-CEA-FSH-R4-23-025



Table of Contents

I.	Compliance with the Montana Environmental Policy Act	3
II.	Background and Description of Proposed Project	3
III.	Purpose and Need	
IV.		
	List of Mitigations, Stipulations	
v. VI.	Alternatives Considered	
vı. VII.		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
VIII.		
IX.	Public Participation	
	Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis	
XI.	EA Preparation and Review	. 14

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. <u>Background and Description of Proposed Project</u>

Name of Project: Kelly Reservoir Illegal Fish Removal

Kelly Reservoir is a private reservoir located approximately six miles northeast of Choteau, Montana. This six-acre reservoir is actively enrolled in FWP's Private Pond Access Program and is stocked annually with rainbow trout. This public access agreement provides fishing opportunities for anglers and regional FWP staff monitor and maintain the fishery. Standardized 2023 fall sampling discovered an illegal introduction of walleye. This species is undesirable to the landowner and poses a risk to the quality of the current fishery. Where possible and where necessary, FWP mitigates threats of illegal introductions. Regional staff propose to coordinate with the

landowners to remove the illegally introduced walleye through mechanical methods and restore the rainbow trout fishery.

Affected Area / Location of Proposed Project:

Legal Description

Latitude/Longitude: 47.86574 -112.12824
 Section, Township, and Range: 24N 4W 4

o Town/City, County, Montana: Choteau, Teton County, Montana

Location Map



Figure 1. Kelly Reservoir located northeast of Choteau, Montana.



Figure 2. Kelly Reservoir and immediate surrounding features.

III. Purpose and Need

The EA must include a description of the purpose and need or benefits of the proposed project. ARM 12.2.432(3)(b). Benefits of the proposed project refer to benefits to the resource, public, department, state, and/or other.

The purpose of the proposed project is to implement mechanical fish removal methods to eliminate the existing fishery specifically, the illegally introduced walleye. FWP will restock the pond with rainbow trout following confirmation that the fish removal was successful.

Initial removal techniques will include lowering reservoir elevations and ending supplemental aeration. This should induce a winterkill. FWP will monitor the reservoir during the winter and spring to ensure that the winterkill occurred as expected. Additional sampling efforts will occur throughout the spring and summer prior to restocking. Post-treatment changes to the restocked rainbow trout fishery will be monitoring by FWP fishery biologists during biannual long-term sampling efforts.

If FWP prepared a cost/benefit analysis before completion of the EA, the EA must contain the cost/benefit analysis or a reference to it. ARM 12.2.432(3)(b).

	Yes*	No
Was a cost/benefit analysis prepared for the proposed project?		\boxtimes

^{*} 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 RegulatoryResponsibilities

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 requirements but does not necessarily represent a complete and comprehensive list of all permits, certificates, or approvals needed for the proposed project. 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

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)(a).

Table 2: Listing and Evaluation of Enforceable Mitigations Limiting Impacts

Are enforceable contro	ols limiting potential impa	Yes □	No ⊠	
action? If not, no furth	er evaluation is needed.			
If yes, are these contro	ols being relied upon to lim	Yes □	No ⊠	
of significance? If yes,	list the enforceable contr			
Enforceable Control	Responsible Agency	Effect of Enforceable	Control on	
		Proposed Project		

VI. Alternatives Considered

In addition to the proposed project, and as required by MEPA, FWP analyzes the "No-Action" alternative in this EA. 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. The "No Action" alternative forms the baseline from which the potential impacts of the proposed Project can be measured.

Alternative 1:

No Action

Under the No Action alternative, the department would not take additional action to remove the illegally introduced walleye. The department would remove the reservoir from the Private Pond Access Program and would no longer stock the reservoir with rainbow trout.

	Yes*	No
Were any additional alternatives considered and dismissed?		\boxtimes

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

VII. Summary of Potential Impacts of the Proposed Project 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.

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. 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 environment or human population 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.

Under the No Action alternative, the department would not take additional action to remove the illegally introduced walleye. The department would remove the reservoir from the Private Pond Access Program and would no longer stock the reservoir with rainbow trout.

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

See Table 3 (Impacts on Physical Environment) and Table 4 (Impacts on Human Population) below.

Table 3 - Potential Impacts of Proposed Project on the Physical Environment

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	Durat	tion of In	npact		Seve	erity of Im	pact		
Resource	None	Short- Term	Long- Term	None	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Summary of Potential Direct, Secondary, and Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats									Mechanical methods to remove the illegally introduced walleye may lead to moderate change to the species composition of the aquatic community. Decreasing the reservoir elevation or ending supplemental aeration may lead to moderate changes to the habitat. Though impacts to the terrestrial, avian, and aquatic habitat may be moderate the duration will be short term.
Water quality, quantity, and distribution									No significant adverse impacts to water quality, quantity, and distribution are expected. Water quantity may be minorly impacted however, the impact is projected to be of short duration.
Geology	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to geology is expected.
Soil quality, stability, and moisture	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to soil quality, stability, and moisture is expected.
Vegetation cover, quantity, and quality									No significant adverse impact to the vegetation cover, quantity, and quality is expected. Due to changes in reservoir elevation, some changes to the aquatic or semiaquatic vegetation may occur but the impact is projected to be minor and of short duration.
Aesthetics									No significant adverse impact to aesthetics is expected. Due to the induced winterkill and reduced reservoir elevation, a minor impact of aesthetics is expected but is projected to be of short duration.
Air quality	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to air quality is expected.
Unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources									No significant adverse impact to unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources is expected.
Historical and archaeological sites	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impacts to historical and archaeological sites are expected.

PHYSICAL	Duration of Impact			Severity of Impact					
ENVIRONMENT									
Resource			Summary of Potential Direct, Secondary, and Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures						
Demands on environmental resources of land, water, air, and energy				\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to demands on environmental resources of land, water, air and energy is expected.

Table 4 - Potential Impacts of Proposed Project on the Human Population

HUMAN	Duration of Impact				Seve	rity of Im	pact		
POPULATION									
Resource	None	Short- Term	Long- Term	None	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Summary of Potential Direct, Secondary, and Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Social structures and	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to social structures is
mores									expected.
Cultural uniqueness	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to cultural uniqueness and
and diversity									diversity is expected.
Access to and quality		\boxtimes				\boxtimes			No significant adverse impact to access to and quality of
of recreational and									recreational and wilderness activities is expected. Minor
wilderness activities									impacts to fishing opportunities will occur but the
									duration will be short term.
Local and state tax	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant impacts to the local and state tax base and
base and tax									tax revenue would be expected.
revenues									
Agricultural or		\boxtimes			\boxtimes				No significant adverse impacts to agricultural or industrial
Industrial production									production are expected. Minor impact to available
									irrigation or stock water may occur if reservoir elevations
									need to be lowered but the duration is projected to be

HUMAN POPULATION	Durat	tion of In	npact		Seve	erity of Im	pact		
Resource	None Short- Long- Term Term			None	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Summary of Potential Direct, Secondary, and Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures
									short term and timing will be coordinated with the reservoir owner.
Human health and safety	\boxtimes								No significant adverse impacts to human health and safety are expected.
Quantity and distribution of employment	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impacts to quantity and distribution of employment are expected.
Distribution and density of population and housing									No significant adverse impact to distribution and density of population and housing is expected.
Demands for government services	\boxtimes								No significant adverse impact to demands for government services is expected.
Industrial, agricultural, and commercial activity				\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to industrial, agricultural, and commercial activity is expected.
Locally adopted environmental plans and goals	\boxtimes			\boxtimes					No significant adverse impact to locally adopted environmental plans and goals is expected.
Other appropriate social and economic circumstances									No significant adverse impacts to any other appropriate social and economic circumstances would be expected because of the proposed project. FWP is unaware of any other appropriate social and economic circumstances that may be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to other appropriate social and economic circumstances would be expected because of the proposed project.

Table 6: Determining the Significance of Impacts on the Quality of the Human Environment

If the EA identifies impacts associated with the proposed project FWP must determine the significance of the impacts. ARM 12.2.431. This determination forms the basis for FWP's decision as to whether it is necessary to prepare an environmental impact statement. An impact may be adverse, beneficial, or both. If

none of the adverse effects of the impact are significant, an EIS is not required. An EIS is required if an impact has a significant adverse effect, even if the agency believes that the effect on balance will be beneficial. ARM 12.2.431.

According to the applicable requirements of ARM 12.2.431, FWP must consider the criteria identified in this table to determine the significance of each impact on the quality of the human environment. 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.

Criteria Used to Determine Significance

	Criteria osca to betermine significance
1	The severity, duration, geographic extent, and frequency of the occurrence of the impact
	"Severity" describes the density of the potential impact, while "extent" 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.
	"Duration" describes the time period during which an impact may occur, while "frequency" 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).
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

VIII. Private Property Impact Analysis (Takings)

The 54th 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 7: Private Property Assessment (Takings)

PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESMENT ACT (PPAA)								
Does the Proposed Action Have Takings Implications under the PPAA?	Yes	No						
	#							
Does the project pertain to land or water management or environmental	1	\boxtimes						
regulations affecting private property or water rights?								
Does the action result in either a permanent or an indefinite physical occupation of private property?	2		\boxtimes					
Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?	3		\boxtimes					
Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to	4		\boxtimes					
grant an easement? (If answer is NO, skip questions 4a and 4b and continue with question 5)								
Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement	4a							
and legitimate state interest?								
Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed	4b							
use of the property?								
Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership?	5		\boxtimes					
Does the action have a severe impact of the value of the property?	6		\boxtimes					
Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with	7		\boxtimes					
respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public general? (If the								
answer is NO, skip questions 7a-7c.)								
Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?	7a		\boxtimes					
Has the government action resulted in the property becoming practically	7b		\boxtimes					
inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded?								
Has the government action diminished property values by more than 30% and	7c		\boxtimes					
necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public								
way from the property in question?								
Does the proposed action result in taking or damaging implications?			\boxtimes					

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

Alternatives:

The analysis under the Private Property Assessment Act, §§ 2-10-101 through -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.

IX. Public Participation

The level of analysis in an EA will vary with the complexity and seriousness of environmental issues associated with a proposed action. The level of public interest will also vary. FWP is responsible for adjusting public review to match these factors (ARM 12.2.433(1)). Because FWP determines the proposed action will result in limited environmental impact, and little public interest has been expressed, FWP determines the following public notice strategy will provide an appropriate level of public review:

- An EA is a public document and may be inspected upon request. Any person may obtain a copy of an EA by making a request to FWP. If the document is out-of-print, a copying charge may be levied (ARM 12.2.433(2)).
- Public notice will be served on the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks website at: https://fwp.mt.gov/news/public-notices
- Copies will be distributed to neighboring landowners to ensure their knowledge of the proposed project and opportunity for review and comment on the proposed action.
- FWP maintains a mailing list of persons interested in a particular action or type of action. FWP will notify all interested persons and distribute copies of the EA to those persons for review and comment (ARM 12.2.433(3)).
- FWP will issue public notice in the following newspaper periodical(s) on the date(s) indicated.

Newspaper / Periodical	Date(s) Public Notice Issued
Choteau Acantha	

- Public notice will announce the availability of the EA, summarize its content, and solicit public comment.
 - 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., MST, on the last day of public comment, as listed below:

Length of Public Comment Period: 15 days Public Comment Period Begins: 12/22/2023 Public Comment Period Ends: 01/06/2024

Comments must be addressed to the FWP contact, as listed below.

Output Where to Mail or Email Comments on the Draft EA:

Name: KATIE VIVIAN Email: kvivian@mt.gov

Mailing Address: PO Box 1398 Choteau, Montana 59422

X. Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis

NO further analysis is needed for the proposed action	
FWP must conduct EIS level review for the proposed action	

XI. EA Preparation and Review

	Name	Title
EA prepared by:	Katie Vivian	Fisheries Biologist
EA reviewed by:	Jason Mullen	Acting Fisheries Manager