CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMPANY NAME: Bear Creek Placer (Les Towner) **Project: Quartz Gulch**
PERMIT OR LICENSE: 00734
LOCATION: T15N/R25W/Sections 31 **County: Missoula**
PROPERTY OWNERSHIP: [ ] Federal [ ] State [X] Private

TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION : Les Towner has proposed to dig ten test pits to determine if there is enough gold to be mined economically.

Reclamation Plan: All associated disturbances will be re-contoured to a suitable landform and seeded with a native seed mix. A weed control and monitoring plan will need to be implemented for a period of three growing seasons.

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] The Quartz Gulch area belongs to the Missoula valley and is comprised of Tertiary beds, that were buried by the Pleistocene alluvial terrace gravel and the laminated silts carried by the glacial Lake Missoula. There are remnants of three or four well-defined terraces along the valley walls at different heights above the stream. The overlying mountains are comprised of Belt rock and outcrops of the southwest-dipping maroon argillite can be seen a few hundred feet above the valley. This area is primarily known for its placer deposits. (Stoll. USGS. 1949.)
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] Surface water is present. During this phase of the project the water quality and quantity are not expected to be impacted.
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] A native seed mixture will be applied to any and all disturbed areas. One species of concern was identified by an NRIS search of the area, but should not be affected during the short duration of the proposed project.
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] Eight species of concern and three potential species of concern were identified by an NRIS search of the area. These species are not expected to be affected during the project's limited scope and short duration.
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N]
8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from	[N] The project is located in an area with pre-existing mine disturbance.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	
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?	[N]
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: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N]
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	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
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.	
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: None

    No Action: If no action were taken, Les Towner would have to drop his plans to explore the site.

    Approval: Approval of the plan as submitted is recommended.

    Approval with modification: None

26. Public Involvement: None

27. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction: None

28. Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts: There would be no significant impacts associated with this proposal due to the short duration of the project.

29. Cumulative Effects: There will be no cumulative impacts associated with this proposal.

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

[ ] EIS [ ] More Detailed EA [X] No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By: Amanda Miller