

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME: RJR Mining

Project: MTMMC #220225

PERMIT OR LICENSE: 00588

LOCATION: 8S/12/W/Section 12

County: Beaverhead

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: Federal State Private

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Ron Hill and his partner Rod Tilitzky of RJR Mining have proposed to dig up to 12 test pits using a rubber-tired backhoe and establish a wash plant to investigate the occurrence of gold-bearing gravels in the above-mentioned section located entirely on BLM land.

Reclamation Plan: All available soil and soil materials will be salvaged and stockpiled ahead of construction. Test holes will be backfilled with the excavated material and salvaged topsoil will be applied over disturbed areas. Those areas will be seeded with native seed mixture as prescribed by the BLM. Weed control efforts will include power washing all equipment hauled to the site and monitoring of the newly disturbed sites for 3 years after work is concluded. If noxious weeds do appear, they will be sprayed with an herbicide recommended by the BLM. All refuse, trash and other facilities associated with these exploration activities will be collected, removed and disposed of in proper disposal sites upon completion of the project.

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]
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] Reclaimed areas will be seeded with native seed mixture.
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] The BLM biologist has some concerns over Sage Grouse and the proposed activity may be limited to certain times of the year when the grouse are not congregating in this area.
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] This project is in an area where historic placer mining has taken place dating back to the 1860's. A ditch that carried water to a mill in Bannack still exists. These areas of concern will be avoided.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
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] Any and all disturbances will be fully reclaimed.
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]
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]
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	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	
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]
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

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 _____

October 2, 2008

Date