

# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Project Name:** Jim Johnson

**Proposed Implementation Date:** Summer 2000

**Proponent:** Schellinger Construction Co., Inc.

**Type and Purpose of Action:** The proponent proposes to mine, crush and transport 43,560 cubic yards of sand & gravel from a 5.0-acre site for a state maintenance stockpile near Lincoln. There would not be an asphalt plant connected with this operation. The site would be reclaimed by recontouring, respreading the topsoil and reseeding the site with grasses. The reclaimed use would be grazing. The site would be reclaimed by June of 2001.

**Location:** SE¼, Sec. 15, T14N, R8W

**County:** Lewis & Clark

**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
<p><b>1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:</b> Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>[N] The proposed operation is located in the alluvial valley of the Big Blackfoot River approximately 3 miles east of Lincoln. The site of the proposed operation is used for grazing and a minor amount of gravel has been mined in the past by the landowner. No reclamation has been performed. There is an average of 6 inches of sandy loam topsoil and 6 inches of sandy overburden, which would be salvaged and stockpiled separately for reclamation. The proponent upon regrading the site would replace the overburden and then the topsoil. Microorganisms should invade the soil. There are no fragile, compactible or unstable soils present, no unusual geologic features, or special reclamation considerations.</p>
<p><b>2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:</b> 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?</p>	<p>[N] There are no surface water sources within 1,000 feet of the proposed operation. There are 3 wells within 1,000 feet of the proposed operation, and according to the well logs and the landowner the high water table is at 12 feet where the proponent would mine. The proposed mine area is approximately 6 feet higher in elevation than the closest well that belongs to the landowner. The proponent would mine the site to a depth of 9 feet. Any bulk fuel storage containers would be lined and bermed and be of sufficient size to contain any spills. No refuse or petroleum-based products would be disposed of at the site. Best Management Practices would be used to prevent any off site sedimentation or erosion. The proposed operation would not impact groundwater or any surface water sources.</p>
<p><b>3. AIR QUALITY:</b> Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>[Y] Air quality would be degraded, but the proponent must comply with air quality standards and have Air Quality Permits from the Air and Waste Management Bureau of the Montana Dept. of Environmental Quality for the crusher. To control dust, spray bars would be utilized on the crusher and a water truck on the haul road and the mine and facility area.</p>
<p><b>4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:</b> Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>[N] The vegetation on the site consists mainly of fescue big sage, fringe sage, prairie junegrass and scattered evergreen trees. The trees are off of the proposed mine site. Native and non-native species would be seeded on the site after recontouring and retopsoiling. The Montana Natural Heritage Program did a literature search and no rare plants or cover types were identified as being present on or near the site.</p>
<p><b>5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:</b> Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>[N]</p>

<p><b>6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:</b> Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?</p>	<p>[N] The Montana Natural Heritage Program did a literature search and reported the westslope cutthroat trout as being present in streams near the site and the surrounding area as having habitat potential for the lynx and grizzly bear. The site of the proposed operation is outside of the corridor outlined as having potential habitat for the lynx. The proposed operation is not located in or near any riparian areas that would be suitable habitat for the grizzly bear. No wetlands are present in the area.</p>
<p><b>7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:</b> Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>[N] Steve Platt, archaeologist for the Montana Dept. of Transportation, did not require a cultural resource survey. If the operator of the proposed operation discovers any cultural resources the operation must be routed around the site of discovery for a reasonable amount of time until salvage can be made. The State Historical Preservation Office must be promptly notified.</p>
<p><b>8. AESTHETICS:</b> 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>[Y] The proposed operation is located next to and visible from several residences. None of the residences were opposed to the proposal, but three had concerns about the noise, dust, view, and mining into the water table. The proponent will place the topsoil stockpiles to the west, east and south, which will help to mitigate the noise and view. The operator would operate the crusher between the hours of 6 am to 10 pm Monday through Friday, with the possibility of a day shift on Saturday. The proposed operation is short term and would last for approximately 2 weeks. Reclamation would be completed by December of 2001. The operator would no mine to a depth of 9 feet, which is 3 feet above the high water table.</p>
<p><b>9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:</b> 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><b>10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:</b> Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?</p>	<p>[N]</p>

**IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION**

<b>RESOURCE</b>	<b>POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES</b>
<p><b>11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:</b> Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?</p>	<p>[Y] There will be increased hazards because of equipment activity and hauling of the sand and gravel. The applicant must comply with OSHA and MSHA regulations however, proper precautions will be taken to avoid accidents.</p>
<p><b>12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:</b> Will the project add to or alter these activities?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p><b>13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:</b> Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p><b>14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:</b> Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?</p>	<p>[N]</p>
<p><b>15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:</b> Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?</p>	<p>[N] The site will require periodic site evaluations, but these will be done in conjunction with other operations in the area.</p>
<p><b>16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:</b> Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?</p>	<p>[N]</p>

