

				POTENTIAL IMPACTS		
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	EXPLANATION
						<p>would have no impact on the existing pre-law area because it is dry from lack of irrigation water. If there were an impact it would be short-lived through the life of this project.</p> <p>The asphalt plant would be located away from the pit and any surface or ground water. No degradation of waters is expected from operating the asphalt plant.</p> <p>Reclamation would be to a stock pond and irrigated pasture. The pond would have groundwater and captured irrigation waste water. A small loss of water would occur due to the difference in plant evapotranspiration and evaporation of standing irrigation water, and evaporation from the pond surface.</p> <p>There would be no impact to water quality from mining.</p>
5. <u>AIR</u> ; Quality			X		X	The crusher and asphalt plants would have air quality permits. Fugitive dust would be controlled with the use of water trucks. Air quality reduction would be minimal.
6. <u>UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE, or LIMITED</u> environmental resources						None. Because it is farmed, planted pasture, it is not prime habitat for species of concern.
BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT						
1. <u>TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN, and AQUATIC</u> ; species and habitats			X		X	Because of the trees along FAS 371 and the irrigated fields, this area is good habitat for white tail, mule deer, pheasant, sharptail grouse and other upland birds. Mining would have minimal impact because of the small area that would be disturbed and the relatively short timeframe for disturbance.
2. <u>VEGETATION</u> ; quantity, quality, species			X		X	<p>Hayland. Irrigated mix of grasses. Mining would have minimal impact because of the short duration of the project and reclamation to an irrigation seed mix.</p> <p>Several acres of pasture would be replaced by the pond and its aquatic or wetland vegetation. Net biomass loss would be minimal.</p>
3. <u>AGRICULTURE</u> ; grazing, crops Production			X	X		<p>Mining would result in a minimal short term reduction of grazing and hay production over the whole site.</p> <p>Assuming the facility area was reclaimed to a 7-acre irrigated field, no long term production loss would occur there. Permanent hayland would be</p>

				POTENTIAL IMPACTS		
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	EXPLANATION
						lost because of reclamation to pond. At 3 tons of hay per year per irrigated acre, maximum hay production loss would be about 30 tons per year if the entire 10 acres were converted into pond and wetland. However, use of the area around the stockpond as pasture and grazing would reduce this loss by about 1 ton per acre.
HUMAN ENVIRONMENT						
1. <u>SOCIAL</u> ; structures and mores			X		X	
2. <u>CULTURAL</u> uniqueness/diversity			X		X	
3. <u>POPULATION</u> ; quantity/diversity			X		X	There are no nearby residences.
4. <u>HOUSING</u> ; quantity/distribution			X		X	
5. <u>HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY</u>			X		X	With control of air emissions, mining would not affect any residences.
6. <u>COMMUNITY & PERSONAL INCOME</u>			X		X	
7. <u>EMPLOYMENT</u> ; quantity, distribution			X		X	This highway project would result in temporary employment in the area.
8. <u>TAX BASE</u> ; state/local 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	The area has been farmed and plowed for many years. A walkover of the area did not reveal any artifacts or signs of occupation. If during operations resources were to be discovered, activities would be halted and temporarily moved to another area until SHPO was contacted and the importance of the site was determined.
12. <u>AESTHETICS</u>			X		X	
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	This material is for reconstruction of Highway 191 and other local jobs.

REGULATORY IMPACT ON PRIVATE PROPERTY: The analysis done in response to the Private Property Assessment Act indicates no impact. The Department does not plan to deny the application or impose conditions that would restrict the use of private property so as to constitute a taking.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Landowner, Natural Heritage Program, State Historic Preservation Office

OTHER GROUPS OR AGENCIES CONTACTED OR WHICH MAY HAVE OVERLAPPING JURISDICTION:
Air Resources Management Bureau, Mining Safety and Health, MT Dept. of Transportation, Sweet Grass County Commissioners, Sweet Grass County Weed Board

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Denial

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

APPROVED BY: _____ DATE: _____

Prepared by Jo Stephen,