

INTERNAL CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME: Golden Sunlight Mines, Inc.

LOCATION: 7 miles northwest of Whitehall, MT

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: Federal State Private

MINOR REVISION: 07-007 "Permit Revision to Operating Permit No. 00065, Golden Sunlight Mine, Montana"

PROJECT: Golden Sunlight Mine

COUNTY: Jefferson

OPERATING PERMIT No.: 00065

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: The Golden Sunlight Mines, Inc. (GSM) Stage 5B Open Pit Mine Plan application was approved as described in "Hard Rock Mining Permit Application and Plan of Operations for an Amendment to Operating Permit 00065" (Maxim 1995) after a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) were issued in 1998. Amendment 010 permitted 2,964 acres of disturbance within a Permit Boundary of 6,125 acres. Minor revisions since approval of Amendment 010 have increased the permitted disturbance to 3002.5 acres.

Due to low gold prices, GSM subsequently modified the open pit design to lower the waste rock to ore stripping ratio and did not fully implement the permitted Stage 5B Open Pit Mine Plan as approved in Amendment 010. GSM completed the modified Stage 5B Plan in December 2007. Approximately 2,236 of the 3002.5 acres permitted for disturbance have been disturbed to date.

With current gold prices, GSM would like to modify the current Stage 5B open pit design to complete the permitted Amendment 010 Stage 5B Open Pit Mine Plan. On December 11, 2007, GSM submitted a request for a minor revision to the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The minor revision, called Stage 5B Optimization Plan, represents a more complete build-out of the 1995 Stage 5B Open Pit Mine Plan permitted in 1998 as Amendment 010. The Stage 5B Optimization Plan proposes a total disturbance of 2,458 acres.

The Stage 5B Optimization Plan would add approximately 5 years to the life-of-mine. Projected start date for implementing the Stage 5B Optimization Plan is January 2008.

DEQ must review the proposed revision and decide if it complies with Montana Metal Mine Reclamation Act requirements for minor revisions in Section 82-4-337 and 342, and in the Administrative Rules of Montana 17.24.120, and if it complies with the ROD approving Amendment 011, the underground sump reclamation plan (MDEQ and BLM Record of Decision 2007). No formal approval is required by BLM for this level of permitting. The BLM has already concluded that the Stage 5B Optimization Plan is approvable as a modification to GSM's federal Plan of Operations.

PROPOSED ACTION: In the Stage 5B Optimization Plan GSM identified the tons of rock and ore it expects to produce. GSM also identified the maximum tons of rock and ore it may potentially produce due to evolution in the pit design over the life of the mine. The agencies evaluated the maximum tonnage that may be mined and maximum capacities for the affected

facilities. The Stage 5B Optimization Plan proposes the following changes:

- Deepen the Stage 5B Open Pit by 125 feet from an elevation of 4,525 feet approved in the ROD for Amendment 011 to 4,400 feet above mean sea level.
- Convert approximately 10 acres of West Waste Rock Dump Complex to mine pit disturbance resulting from the Stage 5B Optimization Plan layback. These 10 acres have been previously approved for disturbance.
- Extract up to 77 million (M) tons (with 53 M tons the expected volume to be mined) of waste rock from the Stage 5B Optimization Plan pit layback. Waste rock would be disposed at the following existing waste rock dumps:
 - East Waste Rock Dump Complex (Expected capacity of 10 M tons and maximum capacity of 15 M tons). Waste rock would be placed as a new lift up to 220 feet thick (average of 150 feet thick) on the existing East Waste Rock Dump Complex covering an area up to 52 acres. The height of the East Waste Rock Dump Complex would be increased above the elevation approved in the current reclamation plan. No new acres would be disturbed and the volume approved for the East Waste Rock Dump Complex would not be exceeded.
 - West Waste Rock Dump Complex (Expected capacity of 14 M tons and maximum capacity of 20 M tons). Waste rock would be placed on three new intra-dumps up to 175 feet thick (average of less than 100 feet thick) on the existing West Waste Rock Dump Complex covering an area of up to 122 acres of existing dumps and 17 new acres (net 7 acres) of waste rock dump in the Amendment 010 approved waste rock dump footprint. The net 7 acre disturbance results from 17 new acres less the conversion of 10 acres of the West Waste Rock Dump Complex to mine pit disturbance. The 213 M ton volume approved for the West Waste Rock Dump Complex would be exceeded by up to 20 M tons which is a 9.4 percent increase. No acreage outside the area previously permitted for placement of a waste rock dump would be disturbed.
 - East Buttress Extension Dump: (Expected capacity of 29 M tons and maximum capacity of 42 M tons). Waste rock would be placed on an Amendment 010 permitted waste rock dump area immediately east of the existing Buttress Dump which is also referred to as the Rattlesnake Buttress Dump. The waste rock dump would be up to 300 feet thick and cover up to 200 acres of the area previously permitted for placement of a waste rock dump.
- Extract up to 10 M tons of ore from the mine pit and process the ore through the existing mill facility.
- Place up to 10 M tons of tailings into Tailings Impoundment No. 2 (design capacity of up to 10 M tons). This tonnage would increase the height of the cyclone sand embankment by up to 20 feet. The impoundment would expand in area by 5 acres and a new north dike would be constructed to prevent tailings from impacting the Tailings Impoundment No. 2

diversion channel. All disturbances would be within the existing permitted disturbance boundary.

- Relocate the existing access road to the southwest corner of the West Waste Rock Dump Complex. The relocated access road would disturb 5 acres within the area already permitted for disturbance.
- Extend mine life by 5 years from 2008 through 2013.

All of the proposed disturbances associated with the Stage 5B Optimization Plan, including waste rock disposal, access road construction, and the tailings impoundment raise would be located within the existing permit and disturbance area boundaries. The East Buttress Extension Dump and the East Waste Rock Dump Complex acreage and volume have been previously permitted in Amendment 010.

Mine operations would not change, including operation of the mill facility; delivery, storage, consumption and disposal of materials associated with mine and mill operations; operation of air emissions controls on mine equipment, fugitive dust sources, and milling equipment; and maintenance and monitoring functions.

Current employment levels would be extended, as would the various taxes paid by GSM to local, state, and federal jurisdictions. Goods and services purchased by GSM to operate the mine also would be extended.

The conceptual schedule for life-of-mine development of the Stage 5B Optimization Plan is summarized in the following table.

Stage 5B Optimization Plan Development Proposed Schedule Summary Golden Sunlight Mine	
Event	Date
Last mining from existing Stage 5B Mine Plan	December 2007
Waste rock stripping begins in Stage 5B Optimization Plan	January 2008
Stage 5B Optimization Plan mining rate reaches 1.9 M tons/month	April 2008
Stage 5B Optimization Plan haul-road completed; waste rock haulage to West Waste Rock Dump Complex ends; soil for West Waste Rock Dump Complex reclamation hauled from east side	November 2008
Last existing Stage 5B ore stockpile processed; mill shutdown initiated	December 2008
Stage 5B Optimization Plan stripping continues	----
First ore material mined in Stage 5B Optimization Plan; ore stockpiling begins	February 2010
Mill start-up	June 2010
Production for Stage 5B Optimization Plan ends; ore	March 2012

stockpile processing begins	
Processing of ore stockpile ends; mill shutdown	August 2013

INTERNAL CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Environmental Assessment Legend:

N = Not present or No Impact will occur.

Y = Impacts may occur (explain under Potential Impacts).

NA = Not Applicable

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>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?</p>	<p>[Y] Potential soil impacts: GSM would redistribute 122 acres of the reclaimed West Waste Rock Dump Complex. GSM proposes to salvage up to 30 inches of the 36 inches of soil on the reclaimed acres. The agencies are concerned that 30 inches of soil could not be salvaged without mixing soil with underlying acid producing waste rock. The agencies have assumed that only 24 inches of uncontaminated soil can be salvaged. The agencies would require GSM to post additional bond to haul an additional 6 inches of borrow soil from the approved borrow site. This mitigation would reduce the potential mixing of soil with acid producing waste rock.</p> <p>The agencies would require that GSM replace the soil salvaged from the West Waste Rock Dump Complex on slopes greater than 3H:1V because of its coarse fragment content. The approved borrow soil with a lower coarse fragment content would be used on slopes less than 3H:1V. This mitigation would reduce erosion of reclaimed slopes.</p> <p>This acreage would include 17 acres with a net new disturbance of 7 acres in the approved footprint of the West Waste Rock Dump Complex, 200 acres in the approved footprint of the East Buttress Dump Extension, and 5 acres in the approved footprint of Tailings Impoundment No. 2. Soils would be salvaged and replaced based on approved salvage and replacement plans approved in Amendment 010.</p> <p><i>Pit highwall stability:</i> The Stage 5B Optimization Plan would expand the open pit by 10 acres in the northwest portion of the pit by displacing 10 acres of the existing West Waste Rock Dump Complex. GSM would reduce the pit highwall layback angle from 52 to 38 degrees, enhancing the stability</p>

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

of the highwall. Based on the agencies' current analysis, there are no pit wall stability issues related to the Stage 5B Optimization Plan slope reduction. GSM has committed to further analysis which would be completed by June 2008 which would evaluate the potential impact of the East Intra-Dump on pit stability.

Waste rock dump stability: GSM proposes to raise the West Waste Rock Dump Complex up to 175 feet in three intra-dumps and to raise the East Waste Rock Dump Complex in one lift up to 220 feet. The height of the West and East Waste Rock Dump Complexes would be increased above the elevations approved in the 1995 Permit Application and Plan of Operations. Previous Golder geotechnical analyses submitted by GSM evaluated the waste rock dump complexes at conservative volume projections of higher lifts, maximum waste rock dump footprint, and 2H:1V slopes. These analyses indicated that Stage 5B Plan waste rock dump stability would be comparable to existing dump stability and is unlikely to be jeopardized by the addition of the new waste rock dump lifts. Subsequent to the Golder report, GSM modified the Stage 5B plan to include flatter natural regrade design, resulting in lower final waste rock dump elevations. GSM has committed to further analyses of the final natural regrade designs to ensure that waste rock dump stability objectives are obtained. These analyses would be completed by June 2008 for the waste rock dump complexes. GSM has agreed to implement all stability recommendations by Golder. The agencies agree that waste rock dump complex stability is unlikely to be compromised by the waste rock lifts if GSM follows the recommendations in the stability reports (Boettcher 2008).

The East Buttress Dump Extension would be built according to the design and stability recommendations approved in Amendment 010.

Impoundment stability: GSM would place up to 10 M tons of tailings into Tailings Impoundment No. 2 and increase the height of the cyclone sand embankment by up to 20 feet. The impoundment would expand in area by 5 acres and a new north dike would be constructed to keep tailings from impacting the Tailings Impoundment No. 2 diversion channel. All disturbances would be within the previously approved footprint for Tailings Impoundment No. 2.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	<p>The increase in impoundment height has been analyzed for stability and suitable factors of safety were indicated through critical cross sections of the tailings impoundment with the increased height and higher phreatic conditions. Tailings impoundment stability is unlikely to be compromised by the 20 foot increase (Boettcher 2008).</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>[Y] Surface water quantity reporting to the mine pit: Run-on diversion systems that surround the pit would be maintained, so no increase in run-on would enter the pit. The area of the pit would be increased by approximately 10 acres as a result of the northwest pit highwall layback into the West Waste Rock Dump Complex. The 10-acre expansion of the pit footprint would result in a minor change in the precipitation catchment area but would increase the potential evaporation from the pit highwalls.</p> <p>Surface water quantity and/or quality from the waste rock dumps and tailings impoundment: GSM proposes a natural regrade of the waste rock dumps. The regrade would enhance the approved storm water management plan. Surface water run-on and run-off would report to drainage structures approved in the current plan.</p> <p>Surface water management in the Tailings Impoundment No. 2 area would be operated in the same manner as the current operations.</p> <p>Ground water quantity reporting to the mine pit: The deepening of the mine pit by 125 feet would not increase ground-water drawdown or cone of depression because ground water is currently pumped to dewater the existing underground workings beneath the pit, and only a portion of the workings would be removed by the Proposed Action. The water-bearing zones affected by the Proposed Action Alternative are the same as those affected by the approved plan. The Corridor Fault is the primary water-bearing structure intercepted by the mine pit. Enlargement of the pit would not substantially modify the geometry at which the fault plane is intersected. The quantity of ground-water inflow would not be expected to change.</p> <p>Pit water quality: Ground-water quality is not expected to change because no new or increased sources of water would enter the pit. The characteristics of pit highwall rock would not change from that which is currently exposed.</p>

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Quantity and/or quality of leachate from waste rock dumps: Leachate quality or quantity would not change from that analyzed in the previous environmental analyses because the total disturbed acreage is less than currently permitted and the tonnage of waste rock would increase up to 9.4 percent. The existing reclamation on the West Rock Dump Complex would be disturbed on 122 acres for the three proposed intra-dump sites and connecting haul roads, but would be reclaimed within 1 year. Reclamation would reduce the amount of water infiltrating into the waste rock dumps to levels existing prior to the Stage 5B Optimization Plan.

Amount of time it takes to generate leachate from the East Waste Rock Dump Complex: The amount of time that it would take for leachate to move through the waste rock would increase by 36 years for every 50 feet of increased waste rock dump height. If the East Waste Rock Dump Complex would be raised up to the maximum 220 feet it would take approximately 150 years for leachate to reach the bottom of the dump. This increase in time would not change the conclusions in previous environmental analyses and GSM is required to pumpback and treat contaminated ground water if needed.

Time it takes to transport leachate from beneath the East Buttress Extension: The length of ground-water flow path from beneath the East Buttress Extension is about half that of the flow path from beneath the East Waste Rock Dump Complex (EWRDC). The amount of time that it would take for ground water to move from beneath the East Buttress Extension would be about 70 years faster than that calculated for the EWRDC. The total travel time for leachate to flow from the EWRDC through the aquifer to the Jefferson River would be about 250 to 575 years, and travel time from the East Buttress Extension to the Jefferson River would be about 180 to 450 years. The time of transport was analyzed in previous environmental documents and GSM is required to pumpback and treat contaminated ground water if needed.

Ground-water quality beneath the waste rock dumps. No change in leachate quantity or quality would be anticipated as a result of the placement of additional lifts on the dump complexes. No change would be expected in the quality of the ground water beneath and down-gradient of the dumps.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Quantity and/or quality of leachate from the tailings impoundment. The implementation of the Stage 5B Optimization Plan would not change the quantity and quality of leachate beneath the impoundment as the impoundment is lined. The increase in the volume of tailings would increase the amount of pore water held within the tailings, but that volume is not expected to cause an impact as the impoundment is lined.

Amount of time it takes to generate leachate from the tailings impoundment. Adding tailings from the Proposed Action to the impoundment would postpone draining and desiccating the tailings impoundment by approximately 5 years. The Proposed Action would not affect the generation of leachate because the drainage of the impoundment is controlled by the liner, collection system, and pumping rate to the pond.

Time it takes to transport leachate from the tailings impoundment. For the reasons stated above, transport of leachate from the tailings impoundment is controlled by the liner, collection system, and pumping rate to the pond. This would not change the time involved to transport leachate.

Ground-water quality beneath the tailings impoundment. The current milling process and leachate control systems would remain in place for the Proposed Action, so no changes in ground-water quality are anticipated.

Beneficial uses of water. There would be no change to the current beneficial uses of water in the vicinity of the Golden Sunlight Mine. All water management activities associated with the current approved plan would be implemented under the Proposed Action.

3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?

[N] GSM operates the Golden Sunlight Mine under Air Quality Permit No. 1689-06. Production limits contained in the air quality permit would not change in response to this revision. Once a Stage 5B Optimization Plan detailed production schedule is finalized, a letter would be issued to the Air Resource Management Bureau of DEQ informing the agency of GSM's intention to extend the life of the facility, and demonstrate that production rates would not exceed those used to establish the existing permit limitations.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N] The minor revision would not impact any vegetation outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] The minor revision would not impact any terrestrial, avian, and aquatic life and habitats outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
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] The minor revision would not impact any threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or habitats outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] The minor revision would not impact any historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
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] The proposed change would minimize aesthetic impacts from the mine by using natural regrade designs on waste rock dump lifts and minimize the flat bench appearance of the waste rock dump tops. In addition, GSM proposes to save oxidized waste rock to address aesthetic stipulations in the ROD for the 2007 SEIS.
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]

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N] No other activities in this area would affect this project.

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] No human health and safety impacts would result from the proposed change as GSM has committed to keep the 5,700-foot elevation safety bench and secondary escape ways required by the ROD for the 2007 SEIS.
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[Y] The minor revision if approved would add 5 years to mine life.
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[Y] The minor revision if approved would add 5 years to mine life and extend employment.
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[Y] The Proposed Action would extend the length of time for current tax base.
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	[N] The Proposed Action would not impact government services.
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or	[N] The Proposed Action is consistent with the BLM's Headwaters Resource Management Plan and the Jefferson County Weed Management Plan.

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
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] The minor revision would not impact any wilderness or recreational areas outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N] The minor revision would not impact the density and distribution of population and housing outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N] The minor revision would not impact social structures and mores outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N] The minor revision would not impact cultural uniqueness and diversity outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.
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] The Proposed Action would not impact private property use.
22. PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Does the proposed regulatory action restrict the use of the regulated person's	[N] The Proposed Action section above identifies the objectives of this EA. The Proposed Action would enable GSM to implement its proposed use for the property.

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
private property? If not, no further analysis is required.	
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.	[NA] The Type and Purpose of Action section above identifies the objectives of this EA. No modifications are proposed that would restrict private property rights.
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]
25. SPECIAL BLM CONCERNS: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), Floodplains, Native American Religious Concerns, Hazardous waste, Wetlands, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Environmental Justice and Invasive Non-native Species.	[N] The minor revision would not impact areas of critical environmental concern, floodplains, Native American religious concerns, hazardous waste, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, environmental justice and invasive non-native species outside previously analyzed and approved disturbance areas.

26. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE (DENY THE APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ACTION): If the proposed minor revision had impacts requiring a more detailed environmental assessment, the agencies would have considered alternatives to the Proposed Action.

27. APPROVE THE APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ACTION: The Stage 5B Optimization Plan needs some changes to minimize impacts to soils. The agencies identified two modifications to the Proposed Action that GSM would have to implement if the Agency Modified Plan Alternative is selected.

28. APPROVE THE AGENCY MODIFIED PLAN: The agencies identified several modifications needed to improve the Stage 5B Optimization.

Modification 1) The agencies are concerned about the potential contamination of salvaged soils by acid generating waste rock if GSM attempts to recover 30 out of 36 inches of the soil on the West Waste Rock Dump Complex acres to be disturbed.

Stipulation 065-MR07-007-001: The agencies would require that GSM salvage only the top-most 24 inches of soil on the reclaimed acres and GSM must haul an additional 6 inches of borrow from the approved borrow site. This mitigation would reduce the potential mixing of soil with acid producing waste rock.

Modification 2) The agencies are concerned about erosion of steep reclaimed slopes if the borrow soils do not contain as many coarse fragments as the soil currently used to reclaim the West Waste Rock Dump Complex.

Stipulation 065-MR07-007-002: The agencies would require that GSM replace the West Waste Rock Dump Complex salvaged soil on slopes greater than 3H:1V because of the coarse fragment content. The approved borrow soil with a lower coarse fragment content would be used on slopes less than 3H:1V. This mitigation would reduce erosion of reclaimed slopes.

Modification 3) If the Agency Modified Plan Alternative is selected, the current reclamation plan in the Plan of Operations must be revised to reflect the actual plan that was implemented.

Stipulation 065-MR07-007-003: If the Agency Modified Plan Alternative is selected, GSM must update the reclamation plan in the Plan of Operations to reflect the changes that were implemented on the open pit, waste rock dump complexes, and Tailings Impoundment No. 2.

29. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: The agencies' interdisciplinary team had an internal scoping meeting on January 10, 2008 (Boettcher 2008). A legal notice on the submittal of the 5B Optimization Plan application was published in the Whitehall Ledger on December 26, 2007 and January 2, 2008, and in the Independent Record on the 2nd, 6th, and 13th of January 2008. No public comment was submitted to the agencies.

30. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION: BLM

31. MAGNITUDE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS: There would be no significant impacts associated with this proposal. As noted, there would be impacts to soil, ground water, and socioeconomic issues.

32. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS: No other proposals in the area would add to cumulative effects from this proposal.

33. RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND/OR TENTATIVE DECISION: [] EIS [] More Detailed EA [X] No Further Analysis.

The DEQ has selected the Agency Modified Plan Alternative as the preferred alternative. This is a final decision.

34. PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS: This EA was prepared by:

Patrick Plantenberg, DEQ Reclamation Specialist
Lisa Boettcher, DEQ Reclamation Specialist

This EA was reviewed by:

Warren McCullough, DEQ, Environmental Management Bureau, Chief
Herb Rolfes, DEQ Operating Permits Section Supervisor

35. EA APPROVED BY:

_____	<u>February 5, 2008</u>
Signature	Date
Warren D. McCullough, Chief, Environmental Management Bureau, DEQ	

36. REFERENCES

Boettcher, L.M., "Interdisciplinary Team Meeting Notes for the Proposed Permit Revision (MR07-007) Pit 5B Optimization, Golden Sunlight Mine OP 00065", File 00065.70, 2008.

Geomatrix, "Permit Revision to Operating Permit No. 00065, Golden Sunlight Mine, Montana", 2007.

Maxim, "Hard Rock Mining Permit Application and Plan of Operations for an Amendment to Operating Permit 00065", August 1995.

MDEQ and BLM Record of Decision for the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Golden Sunlight Mine Pit Reclamation, 2007.

emb\op\mepalea\gsm\gsmmr07-007ea.doc