DS-252

# CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Project Name:** Gravel Permit G-1434-08 **Proposed Implementation Date:** Spring 2007

**Proponent:** Sullivan Bros. Construction, Inc. 303 North Virginia Conrad, MT 59425 (406) 278-7940

**Type and Purpose of Action:** This proposal is to permit, mine, and screen gravel from a 6.41 acre area. The mining process will be to strip and stock pile the upper soil profile. (The soil profile is less than a foot in thickness.) Then, excavate the gravel seam with a 4 yard loader. Screen the material to the required size. Stockpile, or haul as needed. The area has had a long history of aggregate mining dating back to the 1960's. File records indicate over 300,000 yards material sold from this pit since 1988. There are still adequate reserves left however. A general estimate of in-place reserves within the proposed permit area was calculated at 16,000 cubic yards. A 5.5 foot average thickness was used to calculate the estimate. (See enclosed schematic for details of the 6.41 acre area.)

**Location:** T 29N – R 2W – Sec 26 SWSW **County:** Pondera – Common Schools

## I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. | DNRC, Surface owner<br>Un-Leased Surface |
| 2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED: | DEQ: Bonding requirements |
| 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: | Deny the request |

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

| RESOURCE | [Y/N] | POTENTIAL IMPACTS |
|---|---|---|
| | N = Not Present or No Impact will occur.<br>Y = Impacts may occur (explain below) | |
| 4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactable or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] | The soil profile within the proposed area is made up of silt to sandy loam textures, underlain by heavy dark blue-gray clays. The aggregate seam is probably derived from glacial drift material. The Department of Environmental Quality will hold a reclamation bond for the permit area. Reclamation will involve smoothing |

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| | and recontouring the pit walls and floor. Backfilling the top soil and re-seeding. A seeding mix will consist of green needle grass, slender wheatgrass, blue bunch wheatgrass, and either flax, clover, or alfalfa. A detailed reclamation plan will be developed during the bonding process. |
| 5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] Ground water will not be impacted as a result of this project. Cumulative impacts are not expected as a result of this proposal. |
| 6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I air shed)? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [Y] During the crushing and screening process, dust emissions will occur. Impacts are anticipated to be minimal. |
| 7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] The vegetative community will be impacted as a result of this proposal. The top soil and vegetation will be stripped and stock piled prior to mining. The current vegetation within the proposed site is made up of primarily crested wheatgrass. Cumulative impacts are not anticipated however. |
| 8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] There will not be any adverse impact to fish, wildlife, or birds resulting from this proposal. This proposal is quite small in area. Observed wildlife within the area have been primarily mule deer. Cumulative impacts are not anticipated. This area has been, and is currently an active mining area. |
| 9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] There are no endangered or threatened species or habitat present on this site. |
| 10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present? | [N] During the field inspection there were no historic sites found. The lease records also indicated no cultural sites present within the proposed area. |
| 11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] There are no prominent topographic features within the proposed area. |
| 12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, and AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project? | [N] Agriculture is basically the sole industry in the area. There are no anticipated cumulative impacts to other activities in the area resulting |

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | from this proposal. |
| 13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of other private, state or federal current actions w/n the analysis area, or from future proposed state actions that are under MEPA review (scoping) or permitting review by any state agency w/n the analysis area? | [N] None |

## III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

| RESOURCE | [Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES |
|---|---|
| 14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area? | [N] This project will not add to the health and safety of the area. |
| 15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities? | [N] This project will not add to or alter other industries within the area. |
| 16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] This project will not create, nor eliminate any jobs. The proponent will complete all work within the proposal. |
| 17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [Y] This project will create tax revenue and mineral royalty as a result of mining, processing, and selling aggregate. |
| 18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [Y] There will be an increase in traffic as a result of this project. |
| 19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect? | [N] None |
| 20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [Y] There are no wilderness areas accessed through this tract. |
| 21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] None |
| 22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible? | [N] None |
| 23. | CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area? | [N] None |
| 24. | OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES: Is there a potential for other future uses for easement area other than for current management? Is future use hypothetical? What is the estimated return to the trust. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [Y] No cumulative impacts are likely to occur as a result of this proposed action. |

EA Checklist Prepared By: Steve Dobson (Name) LUS Conrad (Title) Date: 5-4-07

| IV. FINDING | |
|---|---|
| 25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED: | Approve gravel permit #G-1434-08 |
| 26. SIGN4IFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS: | The proposed gravel pit is a part of an old gravel pit (Letz Pit). Pit size is estimated to be 6.41 acres or approximately 16,000 cubic yards. All top soil will be stripped and stockpiled and used for site reclamation. No archaeological sites are present in the project area. All disturbed area will be recontoured and reseeded with permanent vegetation following mining activities. The school trust will receive an advanced royalty payment of $1,000.00 per year and $1.00 per yard of material removed. |
| 27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:<br>[ ] EIS [ ] More Detailed EA [ X ] No Further Analysis | |

EA Checklist Approved By: Erik Eneboe — Conrad Unit Manager - CLO
Name — Title

/S/ ERIK ENBOE — March 7, 2008
Signature — Date