

**DEQ OPENCUT MINING PROGRAM**

**SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**APPLICANT:** Jim Gilman Excavating, Inc.

**COUNTY:** Lewis & Clark

**SITE NAME:** Milford Colony

**DATE:** May 2011

**LOCATION:** Section 22, T20 N, R6 W

**APPROVED PERMIT #:** 1296

**Type and Purpose of Action:** Operator has applied for an amendment to extend the date of final reclamation of the site to November 2013, and to change the postmining land use from cropland to cropland and pastureland. The total permitted area would remain 32.5 acres.

**Site Description:** The proposed amendment allows more time to reclaim the site to adequate soil and vegetation standards. The operation has completed mining. Mineral stockpiles remain for the landowner's use. There are no site characteristics of special concern. There is one farm residence south of the site.

**Potential Impacts and Mitigation:** Use of the amendment area would not cause substantial impacts on the physical environment and human population. Proponent would be legally bound by their permit to reclaim the site to cropland and pastureland. The April 2008 Environmental Assessment and August 2009 Supplemental Environmental Assessment are applicable to this action.

**Prepared By:** Don Jackson 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.