

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME: RX Exploration Project: Drumlummon PERMIT OR LICENSE #00674
 LOCATION: T12N/R6w/Section 36 County: Lewis and Clark County
 PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: Federal State Private

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Proceed with the permitted 2006 drilling program (3 holes) and continue with another 8 holes for 2008. Total road building will be 3810 feet (2500' in 2006 and 1310' in 2008) and 8 new drill sites for a total of 20 drill holes between the two years. They will be using a skid-mounted core rig instead of reverse circulation this year, enabling roads to be built steeper, thus minimizing disturbance. Access will be on pre-existing road surfaces and a minimum of disturbance is expected.

Reclamation Plan: Upon completion of each hole they will be plugged at the surface. Roads and pads will be re-contoured and revegetated to control erosion. Weed control will be on-going with a concentrated effort on the existing knapweed infestations in the area.

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] Road construction will be in previously constructed roads and trails that have deteriorated over time.
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]
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N] Diesel emissions from drills and compressors.
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N] Spotted knapweed has infested some of the sites and weed control is an issue. No rare or threatened plants are present.
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] Ungulates and other species transit the area.
6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat	[N] No wetlands, the site is high and dry.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?	
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] See attached letter from SHPO and November 15, 2006 memo. Cultural artifacts such as historic mining equipment and facilities will not be disturbed by the proposed action.
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?	[N] Some drillsites will be visible from the town of Marysville.
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 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]
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N]
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N] The excavation contractor lives in Marysville and this may provide some influx of money to the town.
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N]
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] Great Divide Ski Area is 3 miles to the west, but no impacts to the area are projected.
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
project add to the population and require additional housing?	
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. 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.	[Y]
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:

27. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction: One hole on BLM land

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

29. Cumulative Effects: None

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By: Robert Cronholm
Program Supervisor

Signature

June 12, 2008
Date