

**DEQ OPENCUT MINING PROGRAM**

**SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**APPLICANT:** M.A. DeAtley  
Construction, Inc.

**COUNTY:** Lake

**SITE NAME:** Schauss

**DATE:** December 2010

**LOCATION:** Section 30, T21N, R20W

**APPROVED PERMIT #:** 1924

**Type and Purpose of Action:** Operator has applied for an amendment to extend the final reclamation date from December 2010 to the spring of 2011 to allow for an appropriate spring seeding window, and to modify the species and rate of seeding as requested by the landowner.

**Site Description:** The 9.5-acre site is located 5 miles northwest of Ronan at the intersection of two gravel roads in a rural area (see [MAP](#)) below. There are no site characteristics of special concern or public use areas. There are several rural home sites nearby.

**Potential Impacts and Mitigation:** This amendment would not cause substantial impacts on the physical environment or human population. Proponents would be legally bound by their permit to reclaim the site to hayland/pasture. The August 2010 Environmental Assessment is applicable to this action.

**Prepared By:** Rod Samdahl Opencut Mining Program Environmental Specialist  
Name Title

**Reviewed By:** Chris Cronin Opencut Mining Program Supervisor  
Name Title

**PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT (PPAA) CHECKLIST**

DOES THE PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION HAVE TAKINGS IMPLICATIONS UNDER THE PPAA?

YES	NO	
X		1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights?
	X	2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property?
	X	3. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?
	X	4. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership?
	X	5. Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? (If answer is NO, skip questions 5a and 5b and continue with question 6.)
		5a. Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interests?
		5b. Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property?
	X	6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property?
	X	7. Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public generally? (If the answer is NO, skip questions 7a-7c)
		7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?
		7b. Has the government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded?
		7c. Has the government action diminished property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question?

Taking or damaging implications exist if YES is checked in response to question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if NO is checked in response to questions 5a or 5b.

If taking or damaging implications exist, the agency must comply with § 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act, to include the preparation of a taking or damaging impact assessment. Normally, the preparation of an impact assessment will require consultation with agency legal staff.

MAP

