

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Schwend

Proposed Implementation Date: 05/01/00

Proponent: Marvin Schwend

Type and Purpose of Action: Owner/operator intends to disturb 2 acres of ground to conduct a mining and crushing operation.

Location: NE¼NW¼ Sec 22 T6S R23E

County: Carbon

N = Not present or No Impact will occur.

Y = Impacts may occur (explain under Potential Impacts).

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>[Y] The site lies at the edge of an alluvial terrace about horizontal and 35 vertical feet above the Clark's Fork of the Yellowstone. The surface is level across 90% of the site. The far eastern edge slopes steeply toward the Clark's Fork.</p> <p>Soils are in the "Glenberg" series. They are an alluvial, well-drained, shallow loam overlying gravel substratum. In much of the site, the gravels are at the surface. An average of 4 inches of topsoil can be salvaged.</p> <p>Because of the close proximity of the river a berm will be left on the east and a pond may be established to control mining and post-mining runoff. A 4H:1V slope will be established at final reclamation to retard erosion and increase slope stability.</p>
<p>2. 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?</p>	<p>[Y] The site lies about 100 feet west of the Clark's Fork of the Yellowstone and about 35 feet above it. The water table fluctuates because of infiltration by irrigation water. During the summer depth to water may be 20 feet.</p> <p>The mine plan includes 1) reclaiming to a 4H:1V will increase infiltration while decreasing runoff and erosion, and, 2) leaving a berm and possibly establishing a pond to retain runoff and sedimentation.</p>
<p>3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>[N] The crusher is equipped with nozzles to control dust during operations. Most of the site will be covered in product stockpiles until reclamation.</p>
<p>4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>[N] The site is presently an alfalfa hayfield, and rocky knob. The 50% vegetation cover on the knob consists of cactus, yucca, and sparse grasses.</p> <p>No species of special concern were identified on site or in the area.</p>
<p>5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>[N] Deer, fox, raccoon, and other small mammals transit the site, but their main habitat is in the floodplain below. No trees, shrubs, or other common avian habitat exists on site.</p>
<p>6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?</p>	<p>[N] The Montana Natural Heritage Program records search indicated that no species of special concern are located within 2 miles of the site.</p> <p>A small pond may be constructed on the east side at final reclamation to contain irrigation water that infiltrates through the soil column.</p>
<p>7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>[N] An on-site survey revealed no archeological, historical, or paleontological resources. The site has been previously farmed and mined.</p>
<p>8. 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?</p>	<p>[N] The 2-acre site is not visible from Bridger or Highway 310.</p>

9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, 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]
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	[N]
IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N]
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N] The project will provide gravel for commercial activities in the vicinity.
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N]
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[Y] In that the gravel will add to taxable commercial development in the area, and keep people employed, taxes will be generated by the project.
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	[N]
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N]
17. 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?	[N]
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N]
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N]
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N]
21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]

22. Alternatives Considered: Alternative #1: Denial. The owner of the resource would be denied full utilization of his property at this time.

23. Public Involvement, Agencies, Groups or Individuals contacted: Montana Natural Heritage Program, State Historic Preservation Office, Weed Control District

24. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction, List of Permits Needed: Mine Safety & Health Administration for safety permit; Montana Department of Labor & Industry, Bureau of Safety for safety permit.

25. Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts: Impacts are unlikely to be significant on the general environment because of the small area of disturbance and the short duration of the project.

26. Regulatory Impact on Private Property: The analysis conducted in response to the Private Property Assessment Act indicates no impact.

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By: Jo Stephen Title: Reclamation Specialist

Approved By: Jerry Burke Title: Opencut Mining Program Supervisor, IEMB

Signature

Date