

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

SITE NAME: Melville
 LOCATION: SE of Sec 29 T1S R33E

APPLICANT: Riverside
 COUNTY: Big Horn

PROPOSED ACTION: Riverside intends to mine 50,000 cu. yds. of gravel from a 10-acre site near Hardin. Material would be used mainly for road reconstruction jobs. An asphalt plant would also be used. Access to the site is from a county road and landowner private drive. The reclamation bond is \$38,304.75. Final reclamation to pre-mine land use of farmland would be accomplished by December of 2006.

A: Significant Unavoidable Impacts B: Insignificant as a result of conditioned mitigation C: Insignificant as proposed

	POTENTIAL IMPACTS					
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	EXPLANATION
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT						
1. <u>TOPOGRAPHY, LAND USE</u>			X	X		The site lies on a terrace above Peritsa Creek. The area is very flat and breaks off steeply 100 feet to the creek valley.
2. <u>GEOLOGY</u> ; Stability			X	X		This area is composed of alluvial deposits of the Big Horn.
3. <u>SOILS</u> ; Quality, Distribution			X		X	Soils are mainly good loams about 12 inches deep. The sandy gravel overburden's depth varies considerably from 0 to many feet. Precipitation is about 16 inches.
4. <u>WATER</u> ; Quality; Quantity; Distribution			X		X	The applicant does not intend to mine in the water. Static water depths from nearby wells and the test pits indicate that the groundwater level is slightly over 15 feet deep. The pits, sampled in May 2005 stopped in damp gravel. The maximum depth of mining would be 14 feet from the surface. The addition of 3 feet of overburden and topsoil would result in the reclaimed surface being more than 3 feet above the high water level.
5. <u>AIR</u> ; Quality			X		X	Fugitive dust would be controlled by use of a water truck. Both the crusher and asphalt plant have air quality permits.
6. <u>UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE, or LIMITED</u> environmental resources			X		X	None.
BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT						
1. <u>TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN, and AQUATIC</u> ; species and habitats			X		X	Deer, coyotes, pheasant
2. <u>VEGETATION</u> ; quantity, quality, species			X		X	Cropland. No riparian habitat or wetlands occur onsite
3. <u>AGRICULTURE</u> ; grazing, crops production			X		X	The site is used mainly for production of small grains.

				POTENTIAL IMPACTS		
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	EXPLANATION
HUMAN ENVIRONMENT						
1. <u>SOCIAL</u> ; structures and mores			X		X	
2. <u>CULTURAL</u> uniqueness, diversity			X		X	
3. <u>POPULATION</u> ; quantity and diversity			X		X	
4. <u>HOUSING</u> ; quantity and distribution			X		X	The development of this pit is for road reconstruction.
5. <u>HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY</u>			X		X	Operations at the site would not cause any health or safety hazards.
6. <u>COMMUNITY & PERSONAL INCOME</u>			X		X	
7. <u>EMPLOYMENT</u> ; quantity and distribution			X	X	X	A direct employment benefit would arise from the construction work. Indirect benefits might be created through the road improvements that make access to residences, farms, and local service businesses easier and safer.
8. <u>TAX BASE</u> ; local and state tax revenue			X		X	
9. <u>GOVERNMENT SERVICES</u> ; demand			X		X	
10. <u>INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL</u> and <u>AGRICULTURAL</u> activities			X		X	
11. <u>HISTORICAL</u> and <u>ARCHAEOLOGICAL</u>			X		X	A cultural survey was conducted on the site and no cultural resources were found. The site has been disturbed for many years. If the operator discovers any cultural resources, the operation must be routed around the site of discovery for a reasonable amount of time until an evaluation can be made. The State Historic Preservation Office must be promptly notified.
12. <u>AESTHETICS</u>			X		X	There are no nearby residences. No noise or visual mitigation is necessary for this site.
13. <u>ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS</u> and <u>GOALS</u> ; local and regional			X		X	
14. <u>DEMANDS</u> on <u>ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES</u> of land, water, air and energy			X		X	
15. <u>TRANSPORTATION</u> ; networks and traffic flows			X		X	

REGULATORY IMPACT ON PRIVATE PROPERTY: The analysis conducted in response to the Private Property Assessment Act indicates no impact is expected on the use of private property.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Landowner, Big Horn County Commissioners, Big Horn County Weed Board, Natural Heritage Program, State Historic Preservation Office

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Denial

OTHER GROUPS OR AGENCIES CONTACTED OR WHICH MAY HAVE OVERLAPPING JURISDICTION:
Air Resources Management Bureau, Mining Safety and Health, Mt Dept. Transportation

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

Approved By: _____ Date: _____
(Signature)

Prepared by (name/date): Jo Stephen