

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME : Melvin Hunt
PERMIT OR LICENSE 586
LOCATION: T4S R4W S ½ sec. 13
PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: Federal State Private

Project: Smuggler Mine
County: Madison

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Drill 1-6 holes to establish location of vein extension at historic Smuggler Mine site. Site visit with Kevin Suzuki (USFS), WDM (DEQ), and Robert Decker (company representative) 5/8/07. Kevin Suzuki will revisit the site with a Forest archaeologist to give final approval to the drill sites marked during the site visit on 5/8.

Reclamation Plan: See USFS 5/3/07 decision memo

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
1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are soils present which are fragile, erosive, susceptible to compaction, or unstable? Are there unusual or unstable geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	[N] Low-impact drilling proposed should not affect geology or soils.
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?	[N] The potential drill sites are several hundred feet from Mill Creek, and all drill fluids are to be contained at the sites. Water for the drill will be trucked or taken from a spring on the property.
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N] There will be temporary emissions from a drill rig for a few days or weeks.
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N] Ground disturbance will be minimal. A few small trees may be cut to allow reuse of overgrown roads
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] Moose scat is present, but any disruptions will be minimal and temporary.
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?	[N] No impact is expected on T&E species. The proposed drill sites are well away from the creek and any wetlands.
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[Y] The Smuggler Mine site is potentially of historic significance due to the number of well-preserved structures in their original locations. All drill sites will be inspected by a USFS archaeologist prior to drilling, and historic features will be avoided.
8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from	[N] The drill rig may be visible from the adjacent road for short periods, but will mostly be screened by trees. Drilling will take place during daylight hours in an

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	uninhabited area, adjacent to a road which does see traffic to recreation sites on the Forest.
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] If onsite water is used, a few thousand gallons may be collected and brought to the drill site.
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] The proposed sites are away from the road through the property.
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N/A]
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N] The project will provide up to a few weeks of work for a consultant, driller, and assistant.
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N] No significant impact.
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] The proposed project has been evaluated in the context of the local Forest Plan, and the Amended Plan of Operations has been approved by the Madison District Ranger for the Beaverhead-Deerlodge Forest.
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] The adjacent Mill Creek Road allows access to recreational sites on the Beaverhead-Deerlodge Forest. Access will not be affected.
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]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
21. PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Are we regulating the use of private property under a regulatory statute adopted pursuant to the police power of the state? (Property management, grants of financial assistance, and the exercise of the power of eminent domain are not within this category.) If not, no further analysis is required.	[N] The drilling will take place on unpatented mining claims on the Beaverhead-Deerlodge Forest.
22. PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Does the proposed regulatory action restrict the use of the regulated person's private property? If not, no further analysis is required.	[N]
23. PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Does the agency have legal discretion to impose or not impose the proposed restriction or discretion as to how the restriction will be imposed? If not, no further analysis is required. If so, the agency must determine if there are alternatives that would reduce, minimize or eliminate the restriction on the use of private property, and analyze such alternatives.	[N/A]
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]

25. Alternatives Considered:

No Action:

Approval:

Approval with modification: No unresolved issues were identified which would require modification of the proposal.

26. Public Involvement: None required by DEQ; the USFS solicited and received public comments.

27. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction: US Forest Service

28. Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts: There would be no significant impacts associated with this proposal.

29. Cumulative Effects:

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By: Warren McCullough
 EMB Bureau Chief

 Signature

 Date