

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME: Madison Mining Corporation (Ralph Johnsrud) Project: Golden Boy
 PERMIT OR LICENSE Exploration License 00414
 LOCATION: T6S/R3W/Sections 20, 29 County: Madison
 PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: Federal State Private

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Ralph proposes to do both surface and underground exploration.

The surface activities will entail hauling away old dump piles with some disturbance necessary for a truck turn-around, location for a generator and air compressor.

The underground exploration will include rehabilitating two existing adits using typical underground equipment such as jack-leg and drill. Material will be hauled out using a rubber-tired mucker, dump truck and skid-steer type loader for clean-up and road/trail maintenance. A patio of waste rock will be spread out and leveled at the entrance to the portal.

Reclamation Plan: Reclamation will be on-going behind disturbed areas to include surface re-shaping and drainage to prevent soil erosion. As much topsoil as possible will be replaced and seeded with native grasses and tree seedlings. All surface area will be reclaimed using the above procedures, as well as any requirements per BLM recommendations. Mine dumps (waste rock) will be left in place and all adits and open pits that were dug and opened up will be buried and closed so as not to endanger wildlife or human life.

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] The existing adits were driven into Achaean schist or gneiss and developed on a quartz vein of unknown age, probably tertiary.
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]
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N]
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]
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N]
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]
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] Per Bob Gunderson e-mail of 7/10/08, he states that the project will be of benefit to all when at closure, the adit will be blocked enhancing public safety.
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]
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]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
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. 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: An alternate route to access the property was discussed and approved to eliminate crossing about 100 feet of private land.

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: BLM

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: Robert Cronholm
Program Supervisor

Signature

July, 10, 2008
Date