

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME: Glovin-Lipman LLC **Project:** Little Lode
PERMIT OR LICENSE 00675
LOCATION:section 13: T7S R3W **County:**Madison
PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: [] Federal [] State [X] Private

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Glovin-Lipman has proposed reentering six old adits on the Little Lode claim, constructing a crosscut in one of them, designated as tunnel number 8, and trenching up to 180' of backhoe trenches on the claim.

Reclamation Plan: At closure, all the trenches would be filled and seeded, the adits would be closed with steel locking gates or backfilled for at least 50', and the dump at tunnel No. 8 would be reclaimed, if a substantial amount of new waste rock were placed on the old dump.

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?	[N]
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?	[N] The operator will be obliged to secure a 310 permit from the Ruby Valley Conservation District to cross Spring Gulch, to access the claim.
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?	[N]
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N]
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?	[N]
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	
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?	[N]
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?	[N]
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N]
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N]
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N]
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N]
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	[N]
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N]
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?	[Y] The operator is seeking permission for temporary access across a BLM WSA, using a good existing road that goes up Spring Gulch.
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:	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	
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.	[Y]
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/A]
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]

25. Alternatives Considered:
 No Action:
 Approval:
 Approval with modification: No unresolved issues were identified which would require modification of the proposal.
26. Public Involvement:
27. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction: BLM approval is required to access the site. RVCC approval is required to cross Spring Gulch.
28. Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts: There would be no significant impacts associated with this proposal.
29. Cumulative Effects:
- Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:**
 EIS More Detailed EA No Further Analysis
- EA Checklist Prepared By:** Pete Strazdas
 Program Supervisor

 Signature

 Date

