

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME: Potentate Mining (Ken Lutz)

Project: Eureka Gulch

PERMIT OR LICENSE: EX: 00739

LOCATION: T6N, R16W, Sec 33

County: Granite

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: Federal State Private

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Ken Lutz with Potentate Mining has proposed to dig fourteen test pits to determine the location and value of reserves on his mining claim. He will take a bulk sample to verify accuracy of the test samples.

Reclamation Plan: Top soil will be stockpiled and saved to aid in reclamation. All test hols will be filled and recountoured. Weeds will be mitigated with use of chemical sprays approved by the County Weed Board. Weeds will also be pulled and cut down. A reclamation bond of \$2020 has been calculated and will be sufficient to cover the work Ken has proposed.

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?	The Rock Creek gorge was carved out by the early or middle Pleistocene. Yellowish to red limestone can be seen in cliff outcrops. An aluvial gravel terrace has been displaced by landslides on underlying red shale. There is little soil in the areas of previous disturbance. Erosion and stability are not anticipated with this project.
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?	Ground water will be directed from the project using a canal. The project is located about one mile from the site. Ken has aquired the necessary 310 permit and a water right necessary for water diversion and use.
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?	Four hundred twenty-eight species of concern, and sixty-six potential species of concern, was identified by an NRIS search of the area. Most of the species fall under the flowering plants family, more specifically Dicots. A native seed mixture will be applied to any and all disturbed areas, and due to the limited scope of the project these species will not be impacted.
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	Bald, Eagles, Canadian Lynx, and Bull Trout are considered to be "threatened" by the USFS as per the NRIS report.

<p>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?</p>	<p>Seventeen Species of concern (Bull Trout, Westslope Cutthroat Trout, Pacific Wern, Long-billed Curlew, Clark's Nutcracker, Pileated Woodpecker, Evening Grosbeak, Brown Creeper, Veery, Cassin's Finch, Great Blue Heron, Golden Eagle, Northern Goshawk, Fringed Myotis, Fisher, Wolverine, and Townsend's Big-eared Bat), and one special status species (Bald Eagle) was identified by an NRIS search of the area, but they are not expected to be affected during the project's short duration.</p>
<p>7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>The area has historically been mined by traditional placer methods, including hydraulic mining since the early part of the last century. The remains of this mining activity still exist in the form of collapsed portals, excavations, tailings piles, mine ponds, remains of log cabins and out buildings, log and dirt dams, and hydraulic diversion structures. Placer mining was active in the gulch, only modest production was realized. The work does, however, include hints of lode mineralization in the Eureka Gulch area that was never exploited to any extent. During the 1990s large placer operations worked on areas throughout the Rock Creek drainage.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION</p>	
<p>11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p>16. LOCALLY ADOPTED</p>	<p>[N]</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	
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.	[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]
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]

25. Alternatives Considered: **No alternatives were considered.**

No Action: **If no action were take then Ken would have to abandon his plans to explore this claim.**

