



				POTENTIAL IMPACTS		
	A	B	C	LT	ST	EXPLANATION
<b>BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT</b>						
1. <u>TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN, and AQUATIC</u> ; species and habitats			X		X	Deer and antelope were seen on site during the inspection. Mining would have minimal impact because of the small area that would be disturbed.
2. <u>VEGETATION</u> ; quantity, quality, species			X		X	The site is vegetated with grasses and only a few shrubs. Mining would have minimal impact because of the small new area to be disturbed and reclamation to a dryland seed mix.
3. <u>AGRICULTURE</u> ; grazing, crops Production			X		X	Mining would result in a minimal short term reduction of vegetation for grazing.
<b>HUMAN ENVIRONMENT</b>						
1. <u>SOCIAL</u> ; structures and mores			X		X	
2. <u>CULTURAL</u> uniqueness/diversity			X		X	
3. <u>POPULATION</u> ; quantity/diversity			X		X	Except for the landowner's, no homes are within a mile of the site.
4. <u>HOUSING</u> ; quantity/distribution			X		X	
5. <u>HUMAN HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</u>			X		X	
6. <u>COMMUNITY &amp; PERSONAL INCOME</u>			X		X	
7. <u>EMPLOYMENT</u> ; quantity, distribution			X		X	
8. <u>TAX BASE</u> ; state/local tax revenue			X		X	
9. <u>GOVERNMENT SERVICES</u> ; demand			X		X	
10. <u>INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL and AGRICULTURAL</u> activities			X		X	
11. <u>HISTORICAL and ARCHAEOLOGICAL</u>			X		X	A walkover of the area did not reveal any artifacts or signs of occupation. If during operations cultural resources were to be discovered, activities would be halted and temporarily moved to another area until SHPO was contacted and the importance of the site was determined.
12. <u>AESTHETICS</u>			X		X	
13. <u>ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS and GOALS</u> ; local and regional			X		X	
14. <u>DEMANDS on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES</u> of land, water, air and energy			X		X	
15. <u>TRANSPORTATION</u> ; networks			X		X	This material is for construction and maintenance of area

						<b>POTENTIAL IMPACTS</b>
	A	B	C	LT	ST	EXPLANATION
and traffic flows						roads.

**REGULATORY IMPACT ON PRIVATE PROPERTY:** The analysis done in response to the Private Property Assessment Act indicates no impact. The Department does not plan to deny the application or impose conditions that would restrict the use of private property so as to constitute a taking.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:** Landowner, Natural Heritage Program, State Historic Preservation Office

**OTHER GROUPS OR AGENCIES CONTACTED OR WHICH MAY HAVE OVERLAPPING JURISDICTION:**  
Air Resources Management Bureau, Mining Safety and Health, MT Dept. of Transportation, Sweet Grass County Commissioners, Sweet Grass County Weed Board

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:** Denial

**RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING PREPARATION OF AN EIS:** Unnecessary, No Significant Impacts

APPROVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by Jo Stephen, March, 2009