



March 5, 2020

RE: Notice of release and public comment period for the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Amendment 009 to Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit No. 00113 for Montana Tunnels Mining Inc. (MTMI)

Dear Interested Party:

The Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has released a Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for an amendment of MTMI's Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit No. 00113. DEQ is proposing to modify the Reclamation Plan for MTMI because DEQ has determined, as prescribed in Montana Code Annotated (MCA) 82-4-337(4), that the previously adopted Reclamation Plan is impossible and impractical to implement for Clancy Creek and the shop building.

On June 4, 2018, DEQ initiated a permit amendment (Amendment 009) to Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 for MTMI. 82-4-337 (4), MCA, allows DEQ to modify the reclamation plan after timely notice and opportunity for hearing, at any time during the term of the permit and for any of the following reasons:

- (a) to modify the requirements so that they will not conflict with existing laws;
- (b) when the previously adopted reclamation plan is impossible or impracticable to implement and maintain;
- (c) when significant environmental problem situations not permitted under the terms of regulatory permits held by the permittee are revealed by field inspection and DEQ has the authority to address them under the provisions of this part.

In accordance with 82-4-337(4)(c), MCA, DEQ has determined that an updated reclamation plan is required to address the long-term reclamation of Clancy Creek under the "L-Pit" operations. The "L-Pit" disturbance is the disturbance that remains at this site today. The proposed amendment would update the MTMI reclamation plan to address the long-term routing of Clancy Creek away from the open pit and to address the timing of removal of the shop building.

DEQ has not identified an imminent danger to public health, public safety, or to the environment from the current site conditions at MTMI (MCA 82-4-338(10)(a)). However, DEQ has identified, beginning with 2013 and 2014 field inspections and continuing with subsequent field inspections, a significant environmental problem with the current Reclamation Plan as it applies to Clancy Creek. MTMI temporarily addressed the problems with Clancy Creek by installing plastic pipe to deliver the flow of Clancy Creek past the pit-threatened area of the creek. A permanent solution for the flow of Clancy Creek has not been added to the Reclamation Plan by MTMI. The revised MTMI Reclamation Plan will require that MTMI establish a permanent solution to address the diversion of Clancy Creek past the pit-threatened area of the creek. DEQ has the authority to modify the existing Reclamation Plan under the authority granted by MCA 82-4-337(4).

The Draft EA is available for public comment from March 5, 2020 to April 6, 2020. All comments become part of the public record for this project and are available for public review, along with the name(s) of the commenter(s). The Draft EA has been posted on DEQ's website at (<http://deq.mt.gov/Public/ea/hardrock>). Digital copies of the Draft EA may be requested by contacting Dan Walsh by telephone at (406) 444-6791 or by e-mail at dwalsh@mt.gov.

Written comments may be submitted via electronic mail at DEQMEPA@mt.gov or via postal mail at:

Department of Environmental Quality
Hard Rock Mining Bureau
c/o Dan Walsh
P.O. Box 200901
Helena, MT 59620-0901

Comments on the Draft EA must be received by April 6, 2020.

Sincerely,



**Draft Environmental Assessment
Montana Tunnels Mining Inc.
(MTMI)
Reclamation Plan Update**

**PREPARED BY
MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
HARD ROCK MINING BUREAU**

MARCH 5, 2020

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Section 1. Project Overview | 4 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 4 |
| 1.2 Purpose and Need..... | 5 |
| 1.3 Proposed Action..... | 6 |
| 1.4 Authorization Action..... | 7 |
| 1.5 Permit Boundary and Disturbed Area Description | 9 |
| 1.6 Mining Method and Pit Description | 10 |
| 1.7 Project History | 11 |
| 1.7.1 Permit History | 11 |
| 1.8 Public Involvement | 14 |
| 1.9 Issues and Concerns..... | 14 |
| Section 2. Alternatives | 15 |
| 2.1 No Action Alternative..... | 15 |
| 2.1.1 Waste Rock Storage Areas..... | 15 |
| 2.1.2 Cap Rock and Low-Grade Stockpiles..... | 16 |
| 2.1.3 South Pond and Associated Ponds and Tailings Dam Top..... | 16 |
| 2.1.4 Tailings Storage Facility | 16 |
| 2.1.5 Pit Perimeter..... | 17 |
| 2.1.6 Facilities..... | 17 |
| 2.1.7 Gravel Pit Area | 17 |
| 2.1.8 Soil and Gravel Stockpiles..... | 18 |
| 2.1.9 Miscellaneous (roads, air monitoring station, scale) | 18 |
| 2.1.10 Mine Pit..... | 18 |
| 2.1.11 Clancy Creek..... | 18 |
| 2.1.12 Facilities (Shop Building)..... | 18 |
| 2.2 Proposed Action Alternative..... | 18 |
| 2.2.1 Clancy Creek -..... | 19 |
| 2.2.2 Shop Building | 22 |
| 2.2.3 Summary of Resulting Site-wide Reclamation Plan..... | 24 |
| 2.3 Expedited Pit Fill Alternative..... | 25 |
| 2.4 Alternative Considered but Dismissed from Further Detailed Analysis | 25 |
| 2.4.1 No Action Alternative..... | 26 |
| 2.4.2 Expedited Pit Fill Alternative..... | 27 |
| Section 3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences | 28 |
| 3.1 GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE..... | 28 |
| 3.2 WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY, AND DISTRIBUTION | 29 |
| 3.3 AIR QUALITY: | 31 |
| 3.4 VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: | 31 |
| 3.5 TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: | 32 |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------|
| 3.6 | UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: | 33 |
| 3.7 | HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:..... | 33 |
| 3.8 | AESTHETICS: | 34 |
| 3.9 | DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:.... | 34 |
| 3.10 | IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: | 35 |
| 3.11 | HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: | 35 |
| 3.12 | INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: | 36 |
| 3.13 | QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: | 36 |
| 3.14 | LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:..... | 36 |
| 3.15 | DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:..... | 36 |
| 3.16 | LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: | 37 |
| 3.17 | ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:..... | 37 |
| 3.18 | DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:..... | 38 |
| 3.19 | SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:..... | 38 |
| 3.20 | CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: | 38 |
| 3.21 | PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: | 39 |
| 3.22 | OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:..... | 39 |
| 3.23 | PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:..... | 39 |
| 3.24 | OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURSIDCTION:..... | 40 |
| 3.25 | CUMULATIVE EFFECTS: | 40 |
| Section 4. | Contributors | 40 |
| Section 5. | Need for Further Analysis and Significance of Potential Impacts | 41 |

SECTION 1. Project Overview

1.1 Introduction

Montana Tunnels Mining, Inc. (MTMI) currently has two mining operations/scenarios that have been analyzed for environmental impacts: the “L-Pit” (analyzed in 1986) and the “M-Pit” (analyzed in 2008). The “L-Pit” includes the current “on the ground” disturbance and represents the site conditions of today. The “M-Pit” was analyzed as a potential mine expansion. However, because the corresponding “M-Pit” bond was never posted, the “M-Pit” expansion was never contained/approved in a final permit. In the “L-Pit” analysis/approval DEQ staff never analyzed potential impacts to Clancy Creek, while in the “M-Pit” analysis, DEQ staff specifically did analyze the impacts to, and corresponding movement of, the Clancy Creek channel. Clancy Creek was impacted by the “L-Pit” beginning in the Fall of 2013. The flow of water from Clancy Creek was placed in a pipe to convey the water past the pit wall and downstream to the lower reaches of the Clancy Creek channel. The flow of Clancy Creek was placed in the pipe to prevent the flow of the water running into the pit. The Clancy Creek issues occurred under the “L-Pit” disturbance.


On June 4, 2018, the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) initiated a permit amendment (Amendment 009) to Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 for MTMI. 82-4-337 (4), Montana Code Annotated (MCA) allows DEQ to modify the reclamation plan after timely notice and opportunity for hearing, at any time during the term of the permit and for any of the following reasons:

- (a) to modify the requirements so that they will not conflict with existing laws;
- (b) when the previously adopted reclamation plan is impossible or impracticable to implement and maintain;
- (c) when significant environmental problem situations not permitted under the terms of regulatory permits held by the permittee are revealed by field inspection and DEQ has the authority to address them under the provisions of this part.

In accordance with 82-4-337(4)(c), MCA, DEQ has determined that an updated reclamation plan is required to address the long-term reclamation of Clancy Creek under the “L-Pit” operations. The “L-Pit” disturbance remains at this site today. The proposed amendment would update the MTMI reclamation plan to address the long-term routing of Clancy Creek away from the open pit and to address the timing of removal of the shop building.

DEQ has prepared this draft environmental assessment (EA) to meet the requirements of the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). DEQ analyzed the environmental impacts of two alternatives: the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. A third alternative, Expedited Pit Fill, was considered but eliminated from further consideration for not meeting the project objectives. The MTMI facility is located approximately twenty-five miles south of Helena, Montana, in Jefferson County (Figure 1-1).

Figure 1-1 MTMI General Location



1.2 Purpose and Need

DEQ's purpose and need in conducting this environmental review is to act on its state action to update the MTMI Reclamation Plan to address site conditions that have changed since the last MTMI Reclamation Plan was approved by DEQ (See Table 1-3 for a summary of permit changes). On June 4, 2018, DEQ initiated Amendment 009 to Hard

Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 for MTMI under the authority of 82-4-337 (4), MCA. The procedural directive for completing an environmental review under MEPA for this action is identified in the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.4.621. DEQ initiated the action to address a significant environmental problem (Clancy Creek and the timing of removal of the Shop Building) that is not currently permitted under the terms of the permit and the corresponding MTMI “L-Pit” reclamation plan. The Clancy Creek issue and the shop building issue have been documented during field inspections and DEQ has the authority to address them under the provisions of this part.

The original reclamation plan was approved by DEQ on February 20, 1986 and has been incrementally changed over time with the various permitting actions shown in Table 1-3. The nature of the current reclamation plan change would be limited to two main areas: Clancy Creek and the timing of removal of the Shop Building. The revised reclamation plan would prescribe the movement of the Clancy Creek channel/pipe from near the pit to approximately 50-150 feet further away from the pit. In addition, the revised reclamation plan would clearly address that the long-term conveyance of Clancy Creek flow would not include a plastic pipe. The revised reclamation plan would also address the timing of removal of the shop building such that it is demolished/removed early in the reclamation effort (reducing the risk that the building might become irrecoverable due to pit instability). DEQ’s action on the permit amendment is governed by the Metal Mine Reclamation Act, Section 82-4-301, *et seq*, MCA.

MTMI’s purpose and need in participating in this permit amendment and the corresponding environmental review is to address current deficiencies in the approved Reclamation Plan. On June 4, 2018, DEQ notified MTMI that, based on the current site conditions, the approved Reclamation Plan is not adequate. In the June 4th, letter, DEQ notified MTMI of the changes that are necessary to the Reclamation Plan. On August 17, 2018, MTMI responded to DEQ’s Reclamation Plan changes. MTMI offered its comments on the shop building, general site clean-up, and the proposed movement of Clancy Creek.

1.3 Proposed Action

The proposed action would include an update to the MTMI “L-Pit” Reclamation Plan. Under the proposed action, the MTMI Reclamation Plan would be updated to require that a new channel be constructed for Clancy Creek extending from approximately Latitude 46.373620, Longitude -112.139536 to approximately Latitude 46.376396, Longitude -112.137659. The length of the newly constructed channel would be approximately 2,500 feet in length. The new channel would be constructed in bed rock and would be located approximately 50-150 feet from the current location of the plastic pipe carrying the flow of Clancy Creek.

Once started, the construction of the new channel is estimated to take approximately 60-90 days, but it would be done as part of the overall site reclamation. The total disturbance necessary for the project is estimated to be approximately 4 acres. The time estimated for demolition/removal of the building is estimated to take approximately 1-2

weeks.

1.4 Authorization Action

DEQ is responsible for issuing and ensuring compliance with state environmental laws and administrative rules under the MMRA. The MMRA contains reclamation standards for lands disturbed by mining, generally requiring that they be reclaimed to comparable stability and utility as that of adjacent areas. The Draft Reclamation Plan (Amendment 009) provides sufficient details regarding the proposed Reclamation Plan changes to allow DEQ to determine whether reclamation requirements and standards set forth in the MMRA would be satisfied. BLM may be responsible for reviewing and approving a modification to the Plan of Operations under 43 CFR 3809.432(a). However, the proposed amendment does not affect land administered by BLM.

DEQ is also responsible for protecting air and water quality under the Clean Air Act of Montana, Sections 75-2-101, *et seq.*, MCA, and the Montana Water Quality Act, Sections 75-5-101, *et seq.*, MCA. **Table 1-1** lists the regulatory authority and permits that may be required by MTMI.

Table 1-1. Potentially Applicable Regulations

| DEQ | |
|--|---|
| Regulatory Authority | Purpose |
| Metal Mine Reclamation Act (82-4-301, <i>et seq.</i> , MCA) | MMRA regulates the mining of ore or rock in the State to provide adequate environmental protection. Mining must comply with state environmental laws and administrative rules. Approval may include stipulations for mine operation and reclamation. A sufficient reclamation bond must be posted with the state. |
| Montana Environmental Policy Act (75-1-102, <i>et seq.</i> , MCA) | To establish a process to anticipate and disclose possible impacts, including unexamined, unintended, and unwanted impacts. |
| Montana Water Quality Act, Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (MPDES) (75-5-101, <i>et seq.</i> , MCA) | To establish effluent limits, treatment standards, and other requirements for point source discharges to state waters including ground water for active mine areas. Discharges to waters may not violate water quality standards. |
| Site-Specific Standards of Water Quality for Aquatic Life (75-7-101, MCA (aka 310 Permit)) | Montana's Natural Streambed and Land Preservation Act, requires any person planning to disturb the bed or banks of a perennially-flowing stream or river to first obtain a 310 Permit from their local conservation district, so as to minimize erosion and sedimentation. |
| Short-Term Water Quality Standards for Turbidity (75-5-318, MCA (aka 318 Authorization)) | Operators of a short-term construction or construction-related activity that could result in a release of sediment or turbid water must obtain authorization prior to beginning the project. Each authorization will include conditions that minimize, to the extent practicable, the magnitude of any change in water quality and the length of time during which any change may occur. Some may |

| DEQ | |
|---|--|
| Regulatory Authority | Purpose |
| | include site-specific requirements that ensure the activity does not have any long-term impact on existing and beneficial uses of state water. |
| Federal Clean Water Act (401 Water Quality Certification) | The federal Clean Water Act requires state certification for any permit or license issued by a federal agency for an activity that may result in a discharge to state waters, including wetlands. This requirement allows Montana to have input into federally approved projects that may affect its waters (rivers, streams, lakes, and wetlands) and in protecting water quality by applying state water quality standards. |
| Stormwater Permits (75-5-101, et seq., MCA) | Stormwater is rain and snow melt that runs off surfaces such as rooftops, paved streets, highways, and parking lots and that does not percolate into the soil. As water runs off these surfaces, it carries pollutants such as sediment, oil, fertilizers, pesticides, trash, animal waste and a variety of other pollutants that can negatively impact water quality. DEQ regulates discharges of stormwater from construction activity, industrial activity and from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) primarily through three Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (MPDES) General permits. |
| Clean Air Act of Montana (75-2-101, et seq., MCA) | To achieve and maintain levels of air quality that will protect human health and safety and, to the greatest degree practicable, prevent injury to plant and animal life and property, ... |
| BLM | |
| Regulatory Authority | Purpose |
| General Mining Law and Surface Management Regulations (43 CFR 3809.1) BLM Permit MTM-82855 | To ensure that the exploration for and development of minerals on federal lands does not cause unnecessary or undue degradation. |

Upon completion of the EA, the agencies may (1) deny the permit amendment if the proposed operation would violate MMRA, the Clean Air Act, or the Water Quality Act; (2) approve the permit amendment; (3) approve the permit amendment with agency mitigations; or (4) determine the need for further environmental analysis to disclose and analyze potentially significant environmental impacts. After issuance of a permit amendment, MTMI may likely be required to post additional reclamation bond, as determined by DEQ in accordance with Section 82-4-338, MCA. Because the proposed amendment primarily affects reclamation of land that is not administered by BLM, the bond calculation/assessment may not be affected by BLM. MTMI did not post the latest bond and, therefore, Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit No. 00113 is currently suspended by operation of law. DEQ notified MTMI of the suspension in a letter dated June 6, 2018.

1.5 Permit Boundary and Disturbed Area Description

The area encompassed by the permit boundary is 2,116.0 acres. The area permitted for disturbance is 1,199.9 acres. The current disturbance at the site is 1188.9 acres. See Table 1-2 for a summary of the acreage that is currently permitted for disturbance.


Table 1-2. Site-wide Permit Disturbance Areas

| Area | Acres |
|---|--------|
| Waste Rock storage areas | 425.9 |
| Cap rock and low-grade stockpiles | 66.0 |
| South pond and associated ponds, and tailings dam top | 22.7 |
| Tailing storage facility | 259.3 |
| Pit perimeter | 16.4 |
| Facilities | 37.6 |
| Gravel pit area | 33.1 |
| Soil and gravel stockpiles | 59.6 |
| Miscellaneous (roads, air monitoring station, scale) | 30.9 |
| Mine Pit | 248.4 |
| Total | 1199.9 |

BLM Land

Some scattered tracts of leased BLM land totaling 131.8 acres occur within the permit boundary (**Figure 1-2**). The permitted disturbance affects 56.7 acres of BLM land. However, the proposed permit action does not impact BLM Land.

Figure 1-2. Land Ownership Surrounding Project



Notes: Red outline reflects the area of interest assigned by Natural Heritage Program Search
 Yellow Outline reflects the approximate area of the project disturbance

1.6 Mining Method and Pit Description

MTMI was permitted to open-pit mine an average of 15,000 tons per day (DSL 1986). The mining method did not change during the course of operations. The mine produced roughly 11,000 to 20,000 tons of ore per day. Drilling, blasting, loading, and hauling took place on 20-foot benches as the mine pit was deepened. Annual ore production amounted to approximately 4 to 6 million tons. The ore occurred as disseminated sulfides of lead and zinc with associated gold and silver. Gold and silver also were recovered as a gold/silver alloy.

The approved footprint of the mine pit was 248.4 acres. The mine pit was permitted to extend from the 6,430-foot to the 4,250-foot elevation at the pit bottom. The pit rim daylight elevation (the lowest point on the rim) is approximately 5,670 feet on the southeast side of the pit. The pit was accessed by a primary haul ramp on the southeast side of the mine pit. Since mine operations ceased in December 2008, all pit highwalls have shown instabilities, except the north highwall which is composed of Lowland Creek Volcanics.

The pre-mining water table ranged from 5,650 to 5,750 feet in the vicinity of the mine pit area. Meteoric water and groundwater currently enter the pit. Up to several hundred gallons per minute (gpm) are currently entering the pit. The variability in mine pit inflow appears to be primarily due to variability in bedrock fracture and fault conditions and seasonal variability in precipitation and groundwater recharge. Larger inflows would be expected when saturated bedrock fractures, joints or faults are first encountered, and after spring precipitation recharges the local bedrock aquifer.

1.7 Project History

The MTMI mine was initially permitted on February 20, 1986. The permit allowed open pit mining operations. MTMI was permitted to mine ore from an open pit to produce zinc, lead, gold, and metal-sulfide concentrates for sale into commerce. MTMI was also permitted to process gold ore from the Diamond Hill Mine, an underground gold mine near Townsend, using a combination of conventional flotation and leach recovery processes. The permit allowed operations on private and federal lands.

1.7.1 Permit History

The Montana Department of State Lands (DSL), now DEQ, wrote a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the proposed MTMI Mine in 1985 (DSL 1985). The draft EIS was adopted as the final EIS by way of a Notice of Adoption that was published in January 1986 (DSL 1986). The Record of Decision (ROD) was issued in February 1986, approving the project.

Since 1986, MTMI has applied for and received numerous amendments and revisions to Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 (**Table 1-3**). This draft EA is tiered to the August 2008 Final EIS (FEIS 08-31). FEIS 08-31 is appropriate to “tier to” because the resources and affected environment analyzed in that document are the same resources and environment that would be impacted by the Proposed Action. While FEIS 08-31 was issued over 10 years ago, tiering to this document is appropriate for the following reasons:

- the scope of the Proposed Action is relatively small and focused
- the concept of the Proposed Action related to Clancy Creek was analyzed in FEIS 08-31 (FEIS 08-31 contemplated a further move of Clancy Creek)
- the concept of the Proposed Action related to the Shop Building (aside from expediting the move) is part of the approved reclamation plan and was analyzed in FEIS 08-31
- the resources impacted from the Proposed Action would be the same
- no other cumulative activities or impacts appear to be evident for this project

Table 1-3. Permit Amendment/Modification History Summary

| Permit/Amendment/ Minor Revision | Date | Approved Actions |
|--|------------|--|
| Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 | 02/20/1986 | Open pit mine, waste rock storage area, tailings storage facility, and mill permitted; permit area 1,500 acres, 965 disturbed acres. A draft EIS was released in November 1985. Adopted as final EIS January 31, 1986. |
| Amendment 001 | Undated | Plant site relocated to match EIS. No change in permitted or disturbed acres. No EA was completed. |
| Amendment 002 | 05/06/1986 | Permit area decreased to 1,497 acres. Miscellaneous changes in facility locations and production levels. No EA was conducted because of the lack of impacts. |
| Minor Revision 88- 001 | 05/23/1988 | Changes to tailings embankment design, tailings discharge system, south pond, and monitoring wells below the south pond. No EA was completed. |
| Minor Revision 88- 002 | 08/19/1988 | Freshwater storage pond and water supply system. No changes to permit area or impacts. No EA was completed. |
| Minor Revision 89- 001 | 03/27/1989 | Reclaim water stored in west pond. No EA was completed for the revision. |
| Amendment 003 | 04/13/1990 | Tailings embankment design changed and steepened to 1.75:1. Permit area 1,546 acres. Disturbed acres increased to 1,060 acres. An EA was completed April 12, 1990. |
| Amendment 004 | 05/11/1993 | Two haul roads and cap rock stockpile approved. Permit area increased to 1,606 acres. Disturbed acres increased to 1,086. An EA was released on April 16, 1993. |
| Minor Revision 93- 001 | 11/29/1993 | Historic Diamond Hill Mine materials deposited at Montana Tunnels waste rock storage area. No EA needed for 1,800 cy of material. |
| Minor Revision 93- 002 | 12/21/1993 | Disposal of Washington Mine waste in waste rock storage area. No EA needed for 220,000 cy of material. |
| Amendment 005 | 01/24/1994 | Redesign of waste rock storage area and segregation of waste rock approved. New computer-generated maps corrected permit area and disturbed acreages. Permit area expanded to 1,811 acres to encompass a water return line. Disturbed acres decreased to 1,033 acres. An EA was released on October 7, 1993. |
| Minor Revision 94- 001 | 05/03/1994 | Power line road relocation. No EA needed. |
| Amendment 006 | 02/28/1995 | A tailings storage facility expansion and embankment raise to 5,600 feet was approved. No change in permitted acres. Disturbed acres increased to 1,106 acres. An EA was released on December 9, 1994. |
| Minor Revision 95- 001 | 05/01/1995 | Access road and soil stockpile revision. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 95- 002 | 06/18/1996 | Deposit Diamond Hill Mine tailings at Montana Tunnels tailings storage facility. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 96- 001 | 06/10/1996 | Relocate road to access explosive storage area. No EA needed. |

| Permit/Amendment/ Minor Revision | Date | Approved Actions |
|---|-------------|--|
| Minor Revision 97-001 | 02/28/1997 | New power line to pump station. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 97-002 | 04/27/1997 | Diamond Hill ore stockpile expansion. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 97-003 | 12/01/1997 | Pit reclamation revision. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 97-004 | 03/06/1998 | Pit slope layback and tailings storage facility buttress. Internal Checklist EA completed. |
| Minor Revision 98-001 | 04/02/1998 | Northwest pit highwall stabilization. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 98-002 | 07/24/1998 | Leach Diamond Hill concentrates. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 98-003 | Withdrawn | Contingency location for Clancy Creek. |
| Minor Revision 99-001 | 07/07/1999 | Relocate Diamond Hill ore crushing location. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 99-002 | 11/08/1999 | Expand run-of-mine ore stockpile. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 00-001 | 03/10/2000 | Corbin Flats tailings in waste rock storage area. No EA needed. |
| Minor Revision 01-001 | 10/02/2001 | Gregory Mine waste in waste rock storage area. No EA Needed. |
| Amendment 007 | 03/22/2002 | A tailings embankment raise is approved to 5,640 feet. Permit area stays at 1,811 acres. Disturbed acres increased to 1,163.6 acres. A draft EA was released on January 18, 2002. Final EA released on March 22, 2002. |
| Minor Revision 06-001 | 10/20/2006 | Raise the tailings impoundment by 20 feet |
| Minor Revision 07-001 | 03/21/2007 | Lay back a portion of the southwest wall of the Open Pit Mine to provide safe mining operations |
| Minor Revision 08-001 | 06/10/2008 | Create compensatory wetlands on both the Clancy Creek and Spring Creek Drainages |
| Amendment 008 | 08/2008 | M-Pit Expansion. EIS conducted. |
| Minor Revision 09-001 | 10/07/2009 | Temporary contingency relocation plan for Clancy Creek |
| Minor Revision 10-001 | 08/03/2010 | Disposal of Jefferson City yard remediation waste |
| Minor Revision 10-002 | 11/04/2010 | Processing of Eklhorn ore at MTMI |
| Amendment 009 | TBD | Update to Reclamation Plan to address Clancy Creek and timing of reclamation of the shop building |

Source: DEQ, email, March 21, 2007, Final EIS – August 2008

Notes:

EA = Environmental Assessment

EIS = Environmental Impact Statement

Tailings embankment = Tailings storage facility embankment

1.8 Public Involvement

On July 26, 2017, DEQ received a letter from Montana Trout Unlimited and Earthworks about MTMI. Among other requests identified in the letter, the two parties request that DEQ act to address Clancy Creek. DEQ has met with Montana Trout Unlimited and Earthworks several times about MTMI since receipt of the July 26, 2017 letter.

DEQ will post the EA to its website and send copies of the draft EA to the interested parties. DEQ will take public comment on the draft EA for 30 days. Comments received on the draft EA will be considered and addressed, as appropriate, in the final EA.

1.9 Issues and Concerns

Based on internal scoping and the information submitted by Montana Trout Unlimited and Earthworks, the issues listed in **Table 1-4** were identified. **Table 1-4** also indicates the section of the EA in which the issue is analyzed. DEQ has specifically tiered to FEIS 08-31 for each of the issues identified in Table 1-4 and for several other areas that were not identified as primary issues and concerns.

Table 1-4. MTMI Reclamation Plan Update Primary Issues and Concerns

| Issue Area | Specific Concerns and Questions | EA Subsection where Analyzed |
|---------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Soil and Stability | Would soil stability be affected by the location change for Clancy Creek? | Section 3.1 |
| Surface Water | Would the interaction of surface water and ground water be negatively impacted? Would the water quality be degraded? | Section 3.2 |
| Ground Water | Would the interaction of surface water and ground water be negatively impacted? Would the water quality be degraded? Would the ground water flow direction be altered/gradient change? | Section 3.2 |
| Geology | Would slope stability be impacted by the location change for Clancy Creek? | Section 3.1 |
| Fish & Aquatic Life | Are fish currently present upstream & downstream of the section of Clancy Creek in the high density polyethylene (HDPE) pipe? How would the location change of Clancy Creek affect fish & aquatic life (if present)? | Section 3.5 |
| Land Use | How would the location change of Clancy Creek affect road access? Would recreation access (i.e. hunting access, etc.) be affected? How would the location change of Clancy Creek affect public safety? | Section 3.9, Section 3.17 |

| Issue Area | Specific Concerns and Questions | EA Subsection where Analyzed |
|------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Can the road be closed for good? | |

SECTION 2. Alternatives

This section describes the alternatives evaluated in the environmental review.

2.1 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, DEQ would not initiate/finalize the proposed amendment to update the MTMI Reclamation Plan. The MTMI facility is permitted under Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113. Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 includes the operating plans and reclamation plans set forth in the initial permit application, subsequent permit amendments, and subsequent permit revisions as revised and updated during any deficiency reviews from DEQ. The L-Pit Reclamation Plan is clearly identified in the August 2008 *Final Environmental Impact Statement FEIS 08-31 for the Proposed M-Pit Mine Expansion at the Montana Tunnels Mine in Jefferson County, Montana*. Specifically, the L-Pit Reclamation Plan is discussed in the “No Action Alternative.” Because the “M-Pit” Mine Expansion never occurred, the “No Action Alternative” as presented in FEIS 08-31 appropriately describes the current state of the facility.

MTMI would be allowed to continue to route Clancy Creek past the open pit via a 20-inch plastic pipe (Clancy Creek is not addressed in the L-Pit Reclamation Plan) and the shop building would not be required to be demolished early in the reclamation efforts. In addition, the no action alternative would result in the reclamation bond not being adjusted to account for changes to Clancy Creek and the timely removal of the shop building. A summary of the Site-wide Reclamation Plan, under the “No Action Alternative” is shown in the following sub-sections. For a complete description of the approved Reclamation Plan, please see Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113.

2.1.1 Waste Rock Storage Areas

Waste rock storage area slopes would be graded to a final slope of 2.5h:1v to enhance vegetation success and reduce erosion potential. Tops of waste rock storage areas would be essentially flat with less than 2% slopes. The top of the waste rock storage area would be graded to eliminate depressions and to provide surface water flow away from the steeper side slopes.

Potentially acid generating waste rock would be covered with a 36” layer of non-acid generating material. Slopes would be reduced on non-acid generating material. Cap rock would be covered with a 16” layer of topsoil.

2.1.2 Cap Rock and Low-Grade Stockpiles

Cap rock is non-sulfide waste rock generally obtained from the overburden in the upper highwalls of the mine. If cap rock stockpiles are not completely used, the stockpiles are to be graded during reclamation to match the existing topography, covered with soil, and reseeded.

2.1.3 South Pond and Associated Ponds and Tailings Dam Top

Water is to be pumped to the pit to accelerate formation of a pit lake. The pond is to be reclaimed and converted to a percolation pond to manage the remaining seepage water and surface water runoff from the reclaimed tailings storage facility.

The clay liner of the south pond would be excavated during the closure period to expose native porous colluvial materials and create a percolation basin. Large rip rap would be placed in the bottom of the basin and at the spillway outlet to dissipate flow energy.

2.1.4 Tailings Storage Facility

The final surface of the tailings storage facility would have a 0.5% to 5% slope to the east toward the spillway. Drainage ditches would be constructed to channel storm water toward the spillway channel. To prevent surface erosion and limit infiltration, MTMI would construct channels with synthetic liners across the tailings storage facility surface.

Portable pumps would be used to remove the ponded water from the tailings storage facility as needed. Ponded water would be pumped to the mine pit. Construction of water runoff controls on the tailings storage facility surface would occur when adequate consolidation of the tailings has taken place.

Dust control would be provided during reclamation of tailings by progressively capping the sandy beach areas of the facility following removal of the pond. Water spigotting or sprays would be used, if necessary, to control dust on exposed surfaces of the tailings storage facility. The anticipated consolidation of tailings would leave a natural low point in the southeast corner of the tailings storage facility. Using fill and grading, the tailings surface would be sloped to promote drainage to the spillway at the east end of the tailings storage facility embankment. Surface runoff would report to a percolation pond constructed in the reclaimed south pond.

The tailings surface would be capped with 36 inches of nonacid-generating rock and covered with an additional 24 inches of soil which would then be seeded to minimize water infiltration and to complete final reclamation. More soil would be placed if additional settlement occurred after soil placement.

After soil application, the tailings surface area would be amended with fertilizer

and ripped to loosen the soil. The tailings surface would be drill seeded with a grasslands seed mixture. Run-on control ditches upgradient of the tailings storage facility surface would divert water away from the facility. A spillway would be constructed on the east end of the tailings storage facility embankment as part of the closure activities to route storm water off the tailings storage facility surface and minimize flows into the tailings. The spillway is designed to pass the probable maximum precipitation event. Water flowing from the spillway would be directed into a bedrock chute to the constructed percolation pond.

Reclamation of the waste rock storage area that buttresses the downstream face of the tailings storage facility embankment would be the same as other waste rock storage area reclamation. Slopes would be reduced to a 2.5h:1v. The top of the tailings storage facility embankment and the buttress slope would be covered with 16 inches of soil and seeded.

2.1.5 Pit Perimeter

The pit perimeter would be revegetated and weeds would be controlled. A fence would be constructed to limit access to the pit and cautionary signage would be posted near the pit.

2.1.6 Facilities

The mill structure, warehouse and administration buildings would be cleaned out and transferred to the Jefferson Local Development Corporation following closure. The facilities area, soil stockpile sites, miscellaneous roads, and sediment control structures would be graded to the natural contours.

All other buildings and structures, including the stockpile cover, conveyors, crusher buildings, substation, shop building, garage, lube-bay, and tanks would be removed by salvage companies when they are no longer needed. Some infrastructure may be used for five or more years for maintenance and equipment needs. The facilities area would be graded to the natural contours.

After removal and salvage of buildings not left for Jefferson Local Development Corporation use, such as pipelines, equipment, and facilities, any remaining solid waste would be disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Inert waste (concrete, plastic, steel, wood) may be buried in on-site waste disposal areas. Any regulated materials or hazardous waste present in the mining or ore processing areas would be properly disposed, marketed, recycled, or returned to vendors in accordance with regulations. Standard municipal wastes would be taken to the Lewis and Clark County landfill in truck roll-off dumpsters.

2.1.7 Gravel Pit Area

The gravel pit area would be re-contoured. The area would be covered with adequate growth media and seeded.

2.1.8 Soil and Gravel Stockpiles

The soil and gravel stockpile areas will be re-contoured. The area would be covered with adequate growth media and seeded.

2.1.9 Miscellaneous (roads, air monitoring station, scale)

The 2.6-mile access road would remain at closure. The road presently meets county road specifications. The service road to the waste rock storage area would be reclaimed as a drainage channel as part of the waste rock storage area drainage system. The upper south pit ramp would be reclaimed by pulling back the bank or using fill as necessary to bring this area back to natural slope. Flat roads would be ripped before soil and seed are applied. The pit ramp would be reclaimed from the pit rim to the expected high-water mark of the pit lake at closure.

2.1.10 Mine Pit

Reclamation of the mine pit would leave highwalls as rock faces. At closure, most of the mine dewatering system would be shut off, and the L-Pit would begin to fill with water. Because of stability problems in the northwest highwall of the pit and corresponding safety concerns, vertical pumping wells would be maintained on the north, northwest, and southwest highwalls for 5 years. The L-Pit would remain accessible above the water level by way of the pit access ramp. MTMI's plan is to allow the pit highwalls to naturally weather and ravel into the pit, cover pit benches, and form talus slopes above the pit lake.

2.1.11 Clancy Creek

Not currently addressed in the “No Action Alternative”

2.1.12 Facilities (Shop Building)

The shop building is a “facility” as described in Section 2.1.6, but the current condition of the building was not anticipated as part of the “No Action Alternative.” Therefore, the expedited shop building demolition is not contemplated in the “No Action Alternative.”

2.2 Proposed Action Alternative

The MTMI facility is permitted under Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113. Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 includes the operating plans and reclamation plans set forth in the initial permit application, subsequent permit amendments, and subsequent permit revisions as revised and updated during any deficiency reviews from DEQ. The L-Pit Reclamation Plan is clearly identified in the August 2008 *Final Environmental Impact Statement FEIS 08-31 for the Proposed M-Pit Mine Expansion at the Montana Tunnels Mine in Jefferson County, Montana*. Specifically, the L-Pit Reclamation Plan is discussed in the “No Action Alternative.” Because the “M-Pit” Mine Expansion never occurred, the “No Action Alternative” as communicated in FEIS 08-31 appropriately describes the current state of the facility. Under the Proposed Action, MTMI’s Reclamation Plan would be updated to include

a Clancy Creek Diversion and a timely schedule for demolishing the shop building. The remaining site-wide reclamation activities would remain as described in FEIS 08-31 and summarized in Section 2.1 of this EA. The entire reclamation activities are estimated to take five years to complete. The addition of the Clancy Creek channel relocation is anticipated to occur concurrently with the remainder of the other site-wide reclamation.

2.2.1 Clancy Creek -


Clancy Creek needs to be diverted away from the open pit. An open, lined, diversion channel would be constructed to divert the flow of water away from the pit. According to the US Geological Survey, Stream Stats, the annual maximum stream flow of Clancy Creek just below the project area is expected to be about 2.81 cubic feet per second (CFS) (Stream Stats, 2019).

Location of Clancy Creek Diversion – As shown in Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2, the diversion routing for Clancy Creek would be located along the 5,800 feet contour, approximately 50 feet away from the nearest mapped surface tension crack. DEQ has used information contained in the November 12, 1998, Contingency Plan for Clancy Creek Diversion (Prepared by Knight Piesold Ltd) in its development of the Revised Reclamation Plan. While the evaluation was conducted in the late 1990s, the conceptual details of the channel relocation are still relevant today. The characteristics of the approximate new location for the Clancy Creek channel are similar to those analyzed in that document.

Figure 2-1. Clancy Creek Diversion Channel Location – Aerial View (10/23/18)



Figure 2-2. Clancy Creek Diversion Channel Location – Overall Plan



Design Flow Event - The overall goal would be to create a stable stream channel that would convey the design flow. The Clancy Creek Diversion would be designed to accommodate the flow of a 1 in 20-year 24-hour storm event (equal to 350 cfs). Flows exceeding this amount would spill over the freeboard into the pit lake (FEIS 08-31).

Design of Clancy Creek Diversion - The diversion channel would span approximately 2,500 feet around the Northwest side of the open pit, beginning at elevation 5800 and ultimately tying into the wetlands downstream at elevation 5650 ft. An average grade of 5 to 6% would be present for the first 1700 feet of the channel, that closely matches the overall grade of the original Clancy Creek channel.

A corridor that is 60 feet wide would be built along the diversion to allow for construction and maintenance of the channel. Material excavated from the channel would be placed in berms on the pit slope side of the channel. After excavation of the channel is complete, the area would be mapped to locate any discontinuities or fractures. Grout would be used to seal any fractures, effectively making the channel bed comparatively impermeable.

The constructed channel would be lined with 100 mil HDPE material to prevent infiltration into the bedrock. The liner material will be covered with a non-woven geotextile, then 12 inches of fine grain gravel and riprap material to prevent erosion. As the channel is revegetated with grasses, forbs and shrubs, it will become more stable and less apt to erosion during storm events.

A diversion channel with a concrete drop structure would be required. The upstream tie-in of Clancy Creek to the new channel bed would require excavation to bedrock and partial layback of the hillside. Modification of the creek flow (i.e. grout curtain, ground water barrier,) would begin with a diversion approximately 250 feet upstream from the beginning of the new engineered channel. The creek flow from the engineered channel would then be diverted back to the original stream channel (after clearing the area of the stream channel near the pit). The engineered channel creek flow would re-enter the natural channel at a point just above the existing wetlands. The final 500 feet of the channel would be much shallower grade as it ties into the wetlands.

2.2.2 Shop Building

The mill structure, warehouse and administration buildings would be cleaned to address any contaminated areas. The ownership would be transferred to the Jefferson Local Development Corporation following closure. All other buildings and structures including stockpile cover, conveyors, crusher buildings, substation, truck shop, garage, lube-bay, and tanks would be removed by salvage companies when they are no longer needed. Some infrastructure may be used for five or more years for maintenance and equipment needs. The structural stability of the shop building closest to the southern pit wall has deteriorated to the point that the structure needs to be one of the first structures removed. The updated reclamation plan addresses

the timing of the shop building removal.

Figure 2-3. Photo showing Shop Building (view from North-Northwest – 10/23/18)



Figure 2-4. Photo showing “sloughing” of shop building (view from South).



2.2.3 Summary of Resulting Site-wide Reclamation Plan

The site-wide reclamation plan would be composed of the elements of the “L-Pit” Reclamation Plan, in addition to the changes described in the proposed action of this document. Please see Table 2-1 for a summary of the site-wide reclamation plan under this alternative.

Table 2-1. Summary of MTMI Site-Wide Reclamation Plan under the Proposed Action

| Reclamation Area | General Reclamation Description/Summary |
|---|--|
| Waste Rock storage areas | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Cap rock and low-grade stockpiles | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| South pond and associated ponds, and tailings dam top | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Tailing storage facility | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Pit perimeter | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Facilities | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Gravel pit area | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Soil and gravel stockpiles | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Miscellaneous (roads, air monitoring station, scale) | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Mine Pit | Same as “No Action Alternative.” See Section 2.1. |
| Clancy Creek | <p><i>A diversion channel would be constructed to divert the flow of water away from the pit. The diversion channel would span approximately 2500 feet around the Northwest side of the open pit, beginning at an approximate elevation of 5800 feet and ultimately tying into the wetlands downstream at an elevation of 5650 feet. The diversion channel would be designed for a 1 in 20-year 24-hour storm event. An average grade of 5 to 6% would be maintained for the first 2000 feet of the new engineered channel, which closely matches the overall grade of the original Clancy Creek channel. The final 500 feet of the diversion channel would have a much shallower grade of 0.5% as it re-enters the original Clancy Creek channel at a point just above the existing wetlands.</i></p> <p>The upstream tie-in of Clancy Creek to the new channel bed would require excavation to bedrock and partial layback of the hillside. Modification of the creek flow (i.e. grout curtain, ground water barrier) would begin with a diversion approximately 250 feet upstream from the beginning of the new engineered channel. The creek flow from the</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| | engineered channel would then be diverted back to the original stream channel (after clearing the “pit-threatened” area of the creek). The engineered channel creek flow would re-enter the natural channel at a point just above the existing wetlands. |
| Facilities – Shop Building | All other building and structures including stockpile cover, conveyors, crusher buildings, substation, truck shop , garage, lube-bay, and tanks would be removed by salvage companies when they are no longer needed. Some infrastructure may be used for 5 or more years for maintenance and equipment needs. The structural stability of the shop building closest to the southern pit wall has deteriorated to the point that the structure needs to be one of the first structures removed. Recyclable and salvageable material would be removed from site and addressed accordingly. Any remaining demolition debris would be removed from site and taken to an approved landfill. |
| General Site Area | Remaining site material would be removed from site and either recycled, salvaged, or taken to an approved landfill. Among other items, the general site clean-up should address the fleet vehicles, pieces/parts from the fleet vehicles, miscellaneous barrels, unused fencing, and other material scattered around the mining site. |

Note: Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 includes the operating plans and reclamation plans set forth in the initial permit application, subsequent permit amendments, and subsequent permit revisions as revised and updated during any deficiency reviews from DEQ. For a complete description of the approved Reclamation Plan, please see Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113.

2.3 Expedited Pit Fill Alternative

The MTMI facility is permitted under Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113. Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 includes the operating plans and reclamation plans set forth in the initial permit application, subsequent permit amendments, and subsequent permit revisions as revised and updated during any deficiency reviews from DEQ. The L-Pit Reclamation Plan is clearly identified in the August 2008 *Final Environmental Impact Statement FEIS 08-31 for the Proposed M-Pit Mine Expansion at the Montana Tunnels Mine in Jefferson County, Montana*. Specifically, the L-Pit Reclamation Plan is discussed in the “No Action Alternative.” Because the “M-Pit” Mine Expansion never occurred, the “No Action Alternative” as communicated in FEIS 08-31 appropriately describes the current state of the facility. Under the Expedited Pit Fill Alternative, MTMI’s Reclamation Plan would not be updated. Clancy Creek water would eventually be allowed to flow directly into the pit and the shop building removal would not be expedited.

2.4 Alternative Considered but Dismissed from Further Detailed Analysis

In addition to the proposed action, DEQ also considered the “no action”

alternative and an “expedited pit fill” alternative.

2.4.1 No Action Alternative

The “no action” alternative would maintain the status quo. The approved reclamation plan does not address the reclamation needs for Clancy Creek and the current placement of Clancy Creek flow into a pipe would not be addressed in a reclamation plan. Clancy Creek water would remain in the plastic pipe and the timing of shop building removal would not be expedited. DEQ does not consider the “no action” alternative to be appropriate because the proposed action would not comply with all applicable rules and regulations, specifically 82-4-337(4), MCA. The no action alternative forms the baseline from which the impacts of the proposed action can be measured. The no action alternative was removed from further consideration.

For a comparison of the no action alternative with the proposed action alternative, see Table 2-2.

Table 2-2: Comparison of primary reclamation activities/parameters for two alternatives for reclamation at MTMI

| Reclamation Element | No Action Alternative | Proposed Action Alternative |
|---|--|---|
| Waste Rock storage areas | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Cap rock and low-grade stockpiles | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| South pond and associated ponds, and tailings dam top | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Tailing storage facility | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Mine Pit | Clancy Creek remains in a plastic pipe. Mine Pit receives only groundwater, no surface flow from Clancy Creek. Should the plastic pipe fail, efforts would be made to repair/replace the plastic pipe. | Clancy Creek is moved to new bedrock channel. Mine Pit receives only groundwater, no surface flow from Clancy Creek |
| Pit perimeter | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Pit Lake Fill Time (years) | Same as currently permitted. Estimated to be approximately | Same as currently permitted. Inflow of Clancy Creek was not calculated to impact the pit |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | 450 years (See Figure IV-2 of EIS – DSL 1986) | lake fill time (See Figure IV-2 of EIS – DSL 1986). |
| Facilities (excluding Shop Building) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Facilities – Shop Building | Same as currently permitted. Demolished and removed from site – but no specific plan to remove the building early in the reclamation process | Same as currently permitted. Demolished and removed from site – including a specific plan to prioritize the removal of the building so that it is conducted soon (early in the reclamation process) |
| Gravel pit area | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Soil and gravel stockpiles | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Miscellaneous (roads, air monitoring station, scale) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Clancy Creek | Preserved in HDPE pipe indefinitely | Diverted to newly constructed channel |
| General Site Area | No specific mention of need and/or plan to clean up the general site area to remove excess clutter and debris. | Specific reclamation plan element to clean-up the general site area to remove excess clutter and debris. |
| Air Quality Protections | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |
| Erosion | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) | Same as currently permitted (See Section 2.1) |

2.4.2 Expedited Pit Fill Alternative

Like the Proposed Action Alternative, the Expedited Pit Fill Alternative would follow the L-Pit Reclamation Plan (identified in the August 2008 *Final Environmental Impact Statement FEIS 08-31 for the Proposed M-Pit Mine Expansion at the Montana Tunnels Mine in Jefferson County, Montana*) in all but one area: Clancy Creek. The "expedited pit fill" alternative would allow MTMI to discontinue maintenance of the plastic pipe currently used to transport the flow of Clancy Creek and ultimately let Clancy Creek flow into the open pit. The shop building would be required to be demolished and removed from the area showing the sloughing, but would not be prioritized early in reclamation.

DEQ eliminated this alternative from further consideration because it does not meet the stated need of preserving the flow of water from Clancy Creek. The "expedited pit fill" alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

SECTION 3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

The analysis of the Proposed Action Alternative has been compared against the “No Action Alternative” to identify the potential impacts from the alternative.

The impact analysis will identify and estimate whether the impacts are direct or secondary impacts. Direct impacts occur at the same time and place as the action that causes the impact. Secondary impacts are a further impact to the human environment that may be stimulated, or induced by, or otherwise result from a direct impact of the action (ARM 17.4.603(18)). Where impacts would occur, the impacts analysis will also estimate the duration and intensity of the impact.

The duration is quantified as follows:

Short-term: Short-term impacts are defined as those impacts that would not last longer than the life of the project, including final reclamation.

Long-term: Long-term impacts are impacts that would remain or occur following project completion.

The intensity of the impacts is measured using the following:

No impact: There would be no change from current conditions.

Negligible: An adverse or beneficial effect would occur but would be at the lowest levels of detection.

Minor: The effect would be noticeable but would be relatively small and would not affect the function or integrity of the resource.

Moderate: The effect would be easily identifiable and would change the function or integrity of the resource.

Major: The effect would alter the resource.

3.1 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?

Geology and minerals are specifically covered in Section 3.2 of FEIS 08-31. The area affected around Clancy Creek and the shop building have proven to be unstable. The instability of those areas is the driving factor for the current permit amendment. Large portions of the pit rim sloughed into the pit in approximately 2013. Other fractures, without corresponding sloughing, are visible near Clancy Creek and near the shop building. Moving Clancy Creek further away from the open pit is meant to preserve the flow of Clancy Creek. Some of the instability in the Clancy Creek drainage was “temporarily” addressed by conveying the flow of Clancy Creek water into a plastic pipe and by the edge of the open pit. The location of the proposed action, the extent of the proposed action, and the affected environment for the proposed action have not significantly changed since the issuance of FEIS 08-31 and, therefore, tiering to FEIS

08-31 is appropriate.

Direct Impacts:

The relocation of Clancy Creek is meant to preserve the long-term flow of Clancy Creek. Relocating the flow of water further away from the open pit would improve the likelihood that the Clancy Creek flow would not directly enter the pit. In addition, relocating the Clancy Creek channel would improve the overall soil stability near the pit wall. The new engineered stream channel would be expected to capture surface runoff water in the area of the channel. Under the current configuration, excess flow that does not enter the pipe saturates the soil around the pit wall and increases the moisture of the soil and consequently the instability of that area.

Moving the channel would require use of heavy construction equipment and corresponding truck traffic. A safe buffer distance between unstable ground and where the channel would be moved would be necessary. The buffer would minimize impacts to soil stability. Impacts on geology and soil quality, and stability from construction of the new channel would be long-term, positive, and minor.

The timely demolition and removal of the truck shop should have no impact on soil quality and stability. The truck shop demolition was part of reclamation activities for previous permit action approvals, but not necessarily prioritized to occur early in the reclamation effort. MTMI discontinued the use of the shop shortly after the sloughing that occurred in approximately 2013. Without use of the building, the stability of the area due to truck traffic is not compromised. However, the actual demolition activities would require some demolition equipment and truck traffic. A safe access distance and use of equipment capable of completing demolition would be necessary.

Secondary Impacts:

The long-term secondary impacts on the soil stability would be positive, but minor. The channel would be able to handle runoff water more effectively than the existing pipe can currently handle excess water. By moving Clancy Creek away from the pit wall, the stability of soils near the pit wall would likely improve, particularly during spring months.

3.2 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?

Surface water is specifically covered in Section 3.7 of FEIS 08-31. The proposed action to relocate Clancy Creek is similar to that analyzed in FEIS 08-31. The extent of the proposed action to relocate Clancy Creek, in comparison to the Clancy Creek relocation that was contemplated in FEIS 08-31 for the M-Pit expansion, is much smaller. The affected environment for the proposed action has not significantly changed since the issuance of FEIS 08-31. Therefore, tiering to FEIS 08-31 is appropriate and descriptive of the anticipated impacts for water quality, quantity, and distribution. One notable

change since issuance of FEIS 08-31 is the pit wall sloughing near Clancy Creek that necessitated the “temporary” diversion of Clancy Creek flow into a plastic pipe to ensure that the flow would not be lost to the pit.

The analysis area in FEIS 08-31 for surface water resources includes the Clancy Creek watershed. The Clancy Creek watershed is a hydrologic unit code (HUC) size 12 watershed (HUC #100301011306) and is a subwatershed to the Prickly Pear Creek HUC 10 watershed (HUC #1003010113).

Information for the analysis of surface water resources in the MTMI area was found in the application for Amendment 008 to MTMI Hard Rock Mining Operating Permit #00113 and related technical reports contained therein (MTMI 2007). Surface water quality standards were obtained from DEQ publication DEQ-7 (DEQ 2006a). Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) for public water supply systems were obtained from 40 CFR Part 143.3. More recent hydrologic data collected as part of the application for operating permit Amendment 008 were cross-checked with information provided in the 1986 final EIS (DSL 1986). No additional hydrologic data was collected as part of this project (Amendment 009).

Clancy Creek is classified by DEQ as a B-1 stream, meaning that beneficial uses for “drinking, culinary and food processing (after conventional treatment), bathing, swimming and recreation, growth and propagation of salmonids and aquatic life, waterfowl and furbearers, agriculture and industrial purposes” must be maintained. Applicable surface water quality standards for Clancy Creek include DEQ-7 human health standards, as well as acute and chronic aquatic life standards. Surface water is specifically covered in Section 3.7 of FEIS 08-31.

The potential impact of sloughing and the corresponding impact on the surface water of Clancy Creek is of concern at this site. To temporarily prevent the loss of Clancy Creek water to the open pit, the stream flow was conveyed into an plastic pipe. The pipe has been used to transmit the flow of water past the open pit, but a permanent reclamation plan for the diversion has not yet been approved.

Direct Impacts:

Other than a potential short-term minor impact on stream turbidity from the construction of the new Clancy Creek channel, no other water quality impacts would be expected. The quantity of water downstream of the pit and the distribution of Clancy Creek beyond the pit (downstream of the pit) wall could increase with the proposed project as more surface flow is expected to be captured by the lined, engineered channel.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on water quality, quantity and distribution would be expected from the proposed project.

3.3 AIR QUALITY:

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

The current air quality of the area meets air quality standards. The construction/reclamation activities contemplated by the proposed action would not trigger air permitting requirements.

Direct Impacts:

Minimal particulate matter impacts, or other air quality impacts, would result from the proposed action. Minor short-term particulate emissions and combustion source emissions (oxides of nitrogen and carbon monoxide) would result from the construction activities related to the Clancy Creek relocation portion of the project. The level of emissions would be short-term and minor and would be of similar magnitude to that of other small-scale construction operations. The shop building demolition is already part of the approved reclamation plan, but the demolition would occur earlier in the reclamation activities under Amendment 009.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on air quality would be anticipated from this project.

3.4 VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?

Section 3.4 of FEIS 08-31 discusses the soil, vegetation, and reclamation resources within the MTMI study area. The analysis area for soils, vegetation, and reclamation includes the L-Pit Plan operating permit area and the areas that would be disturbed by permitting the M-Pit Mine Expansion Plan. The analysis area for sensitive plants and plant communities included the area within a 10-mile radius of the mine site (See Section 3.4 of FEIS 08-31 for additional information on vegetation).

Shrub and grassland vegetation types are present as openings within Douglas-fir forest along Clancy Creek. Native grasslands are dominated by various combinations of Idaho fescue, rough fescue, and bluebunch wheatgrass. The vegetation communities are common to west-central Montana as documented in Pfister and others (1977) and Mueggler and Stewart (1980). The two main grassland types are rough fescue and Idaho fescue, and Idaho fescue and bluebunch wheatgrass. Grassland types along Clancy Creek and tributaries are generally dominated by introduced species including timothy, redtop, smooth brome, and Kentucky bluegrass. The project site area for Amendment 009 is the area immediately surrounding Clancy Creek and the disturbed area around the shop building.

A December 2019 search of the Montana Natural Heritage Program database (MTNHP) identified 15 vegetative species of concern with potential habitat throughout the greater

project area. Wavy Moonwort, Peculiar Moonwort and Whitebark Pine, all species of concern, have been observed about 2 miles to the south and west of the project area.

Spotted Knapweed, Dalmatian Toadflax, and Common Hound's-tongue, all listed noxious weeds, have been identified in the immediate project area. Other noxious weeds are potentially present at or near the project area.

Direct Impacts:

The disturbance on the vegetation cover, quantity, and quality around the Clancy Creek channel relocation would be long-term minor. Land disturbance at the site may result in propagation of noxious weeds. The construction activities to create the new, revised channel would be short-term (lasting approximately 60 - 90 days) and would disrupt a relatively small amount of vegetation (approximately 4 acres). Upon completion of the new, relocated channel, the disturbed area around the channel would be re-seeded. The project area would be subject to the most current Montana Noxious Weed Management Plan and the most current Jefferson County Weed Management Plan.

No additional vegetation would be disrupted for the shop building demolition portion of the proposed action. The shop building and the area needed to access the shop building have been previously disturbed and currently contain no vegetation. Final reclamation of the area surrounding the current location of the shop building would be reseeded.

Secondary Impacts:

The disturbance of ground near Clancy Creek would result in a minor increase in weeds. Weeds would be treated as part of general site reclamation. No other secondary impacts on vegetation cover, quantity and quality would be anticipated from this project.

3.5 TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?

Wildlife and birds frequent the area surrounding Clancy Creek. Fish are present in Clancy Creek. The current use of a plastic pipe to convey the water from Clancy Creek past the pit has impacted the natural aquatic life and habitat in the area. The approximate 1200 feet stretch of the Clancy Creek channel that contains the plastic pipe does not function as a natural stream bed and limits the natural movement of fish to the upper reaches of the stream channel.

While birds might fly over the shop building, wildlife do not frequent the area around the building. The immediate area around the building is without vegetation or other attractants, such as ponded water, for wildlife.

Direct Impacts:

Wildlife and bird habitat would not likely improve immediately from the proposed action. However, the preservation of Clancy Creek water from flowing into the pit would have long-term and minor impacts on wildlife and birds. Water that would otherwise become

part of the pit lake would be diverted and would support a base level of water in the Clancy Creek drainage.

The creation of the new Clancy Creek channel placed in bedrock and at a higher elevation from the current location would not improve the viability of the approximate 1200 feet stretch of the Clancy Creek drainage to support aquatic life. From an aquatic life perspective, the movement of the channel to the new location would result in similar aquatic habitat to that produced by having the water in the pipe. Preservation of water from Clancy Creek would create a similar and positive downstream effect on aquatic life and habitat to the situation that exists today, with water being conveyed through a plastic pipe.

No impacts on wildlife would be expected from the building demolition portion of the proposed action because the area currently contains little to no suitable habitat.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on terrestrial, avian and aquatic life and habitats would be expected from the proposed action.

3.6 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?

A December 2019 search of the MTNHP database by DEQ staff identified potential habitat for up to 90 mammal, reptile, invertebrate, bird, and amphibian species of concern (SOC), potential SOC, sensitive, or threatened species. Habitat for these species is common and not unique to the project area. According to the MTNHP database search, Grizzly Bear, Wolverine and Westslope Cutthroat Trout may occur in or near the project area. Canada Lynx, Great Gray Owl, Green-tailed Towhee and Westslope Cutthroat Trout have been observed near the project area between 1989-1994. Several wetlands are located in and around the project area at Clancy Creek. No wetlands are present near the shop buildings.

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to the site reclamation plan that would otherwise be conducted at the site. The proposed action would preserve the flow of water from Clancy Creek, which would have a long-term minor, but positive impact on the environmental resource of surface water.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on unique, endangered, or limited environmental resources would result from the proposed action.

3.7 HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present? This section of the draft EA is tiered to the August 2008 Final EIS (FEIS 08-31). The level of disturbance

contemplated in the proposed action is much less than the level of disturbance assessed in FEIS 08-31 for the same area.

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to the site reclamation that would otherwise be conducted at the site. The level of disturbance resulting from Amendment 009 would be less than that allowed under Amendment 008. No impacts on historical and archaeological sites would result from the proposed action.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts to historical and archaeological sites would result from the proposed action.

3.8 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?

The proposed project would be located entirely on private land. The project area is somewhat remote with little to no public access.

Direct Impacts:

The proposed project may be visible if a viewer is located at an observation point that is unobstructed from topographic or forested vegetation, although much of the viewshed is concealed by rolling hills and mountains that surround the area. Aesthetic impacts from reclamation activities would be long-term and minor, but would not be excessive to receptors in the area. Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to reclamation work that would otherwise be conducted at the site. The proposed project would preserve the flow of water from Clancy Creek, which would sustain the aesthetics of the Clancy Creek drainage. The proposed action would allow for the flow of Clancy Creek to be transferred from a plastic pipe to an open channel. The impacts on aesthetics from this change would be long-term, positive, and minor.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on aesthetics would result from this project.

3.9 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?

Direct Impacts:

No demands on the environmental resources of land, water, or energy would be created from this project. The proposed action would allow for the flow of Clancy Creek to be transferred from an HDPE pipe to an open channel. Amendment 009 reflects a more

viable long-term option for conveying the flow of Clancy Creek water past the MTMI pit wall.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on the demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy would result from this project.

3.10 IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?

DEQ reached out to the following entities regarding nearby activities that may affect the project, however no other projects were identified:

- Montana Department of Natural Resource and Conservation
- Montana Department of Environmental Quality
- Montana Department of Transportation
- Jefferson County
- United States Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management

Direct Impacts:

No impacts on other environmental resources would result from the proposed action.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on other environmental resources would be created from the proposed action.

3.11 HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?

MTMI is required to adhere to all applicable state and federal safety laws. Industrial work such as is required for this project is inherently dangerous. The Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) has developed rules and guidelines to reduce the risks associated with this type of labor, specifically, the labor related to construction/demolition as required by the proposed action. No members of the public would be allowed access to the general project proximity during the construction/demolition phase of the proposed action.

Direct Impacts:

No impacts to public health and safety would result from the proposed action. However, minor impacts on worker human health and safety would be involved in the construction/demolition phases of the proposed action. The potential impacts on worker health and safety would be slightly higher than the existing reclamation plan due to the inherent risk of working near the pit rim. Impacts to human health and safety would be short-term and minor.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on human health and safety would result from the proposed action.

3.12 INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Will the project add to or alter these activities?

Direct Impacts:

The proposed action would have no impacts on industrial, commercial, and agricultural activities and production.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on industrial, commercial and agricultural activities and production would result from the proposed action.

3.13 QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to the site reclamation that would otherwise be conducted at the site. The proposed project would not create, move, or eliminate jobs. The project may create minor additional time that the reclamation contractors remain on site to complete the site-wide reclamation, but would be unlikely to add any new job opportunities.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts would be created on the quantity and distribution of employment in the area from the proposed action.

3.14 LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to the site reclamation that would otherwise be conducted at the site. Local and state tax base and tax revenues would not be further impacted from the proposed action.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on local and state tax base and tax revenues would result from this project.

3.15 DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to the site reclamation that would otherwise be conducted at the site. There would be no substantial traffic added to existing roads. No additional demand for government services would be created from this project.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts to the demand for government services would be created from this project.

3.16 LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?

The proposed project would occur entirely on private land. The project area would be subject to the most current version of Montana Noxious Weed Management Plan and the most current version of the Jefferson County Noxious Weed Management Plan.

Direct Impacts:

Other than the weed management plans previously mentioned, no locally adopted environmental plans and goals would be impacted from the proposed action because no such local plans exist for the project area.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on locally adopted environmental plans and goals would be impacted by the proposed action.

3.17 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?

Direct Impacts:

The proposed action would improve long-term water retention in the Clancy Creek drainage. The proposed project would have long-term, positive, and minor impacts on the quality of recreational opportunities in the immediate area because water would be available for the downstream fishery and for wildlife and birds. The impacts to quality of recreational opportunities would be long term, positive, and minor. Access to recreational opportunities would not be impacted by the proposed action, other than the relatively short time period involved with constructing the Clancy Creek channel. The access road near Clancy Creek would be impacted. Depending on the relocation project, the land ownership of the area needed to move the road, and the actual on-site construction, the future access to the road may be lost. However, BLM and MTMI have already taken steps to prevent the road from being used for safety reason (blocking the access with Jersey

Barriers), so the actual impact to upstream access would likely be long term and minor.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on access to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities would result from the proposed action.

3.18 DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the mine site is currently required, but Clancy Creek is not addressed in the final permit containing the approved reclamation plan. The proposed action represents an additional reclamation requirement to complete the site reclamation. The density and distribution of population and housing would not be further impacted from the proposed action. The workers on site for the site-wide reclamation would likely need to be on site for an additional minor amount of time to address the Clancy Creek reclamation, but additional workers and/or housing would likely not be required.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on density and distribution of population and housing would result from the proposed action.

3.19 SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to the site reclamation that would otherwise be conducted at the site. No disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities would result from the proposed action.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on social structures and mores would result from the proposed action.

3.20 CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?

Direct Impacts:

Reclamation of the site is currently required. The proposed action represents a minor adjustment to the site reclamation that would otherwise be conducted at the site. Cultural uniqueness and diversity would not be impacted by the proposed action.

Secondary Impacts:

No secondary impacts on cultural uniqueness and diversity would result from the proposed action.

3.21 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. Does the proposed regulatory action restrict the use of the regulated person's private property? If not, no further analysis is required. 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.

The proposed project would take place on private land owned or leased by the applicant. DEQ's approval of Amendment 009 would affect the real property of nearby private landowners. DEQ has determined, however, that the permit conditions are reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with applicable requirements under the Metal Mine Reclamation Act and demonstrate compliance with those requirements, or have been agreed to by the applicant. Therefore, DEQ's approval of Amendment 009 would not have private property taking or damaging implications. Section 82-4-337(4), MCA, authorizes the amendment of the reclamation plan. The operator has no vested right to a particular reclamation method, especially given DEQ's authority to revise reclamation plans under Section 82-4-337(4), MCA.

3.22 OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Due to the nature of the proposed activity, and the limited project duration, no further direct or secondary impacts would be anticipated from this project.

3.23 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:

Scoping for this proposed action consisted of internal and external efforts to identify substantive issues and/or concerns related to the proposed project. Internal scoping consisted of internal review of the EA document by several DEQ environmental specialists. External efforts included queries to the following websites/databases/personnel:

- Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks
- Montana Department of Environmental Quality
- Jefferson County
- US Geological Society – Stream Stats
- Montana Natural Heritage Program
- United States Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management

3.24 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION:

The proposed project is located on private land. While BLM land is not affected by the proposed project, BLM was consulted during the development of the EA. All applicable state and federal rules must be adhered to, which, at some level, may also include other state, federal, or tribal agency jurisdiction.

3.25 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS:

Cumulative effects are the collective effects on the human environment when considered in conjunction with other past, present, and future actions. Cumulative impact analysis under the MEPA rules requires DEQ to consider all past and present state and non-state actions. For future actions, DEQ needs only to evaluate those actions under concurrent consideration by any state agency. Concurrent actions include state agency actions through pre-impact statement studies, separate impact statement evaluation, or permit process procedures. Analysis of cumulative environmental effects includes other actions that are related to all action alternatives by location or generic type. The purpose of this cumulative effects analysis is to ensure that DEQ's decision considers the full range of effects of its action on the human environment.

The impacts of the proposed action and alternatives are primarily limited to the geographical extent of the past mining. The proposed action alternative may preserve the flow of Clancy Creek long term and, as such, provide some positive, but minor, impacts beyond the permit boundary. Therefore, the cumulative impacts study area for the post-mine soils stability, aquatic life, and wildlife resources is primarily the mine permit area, but with some consideration of the Clancy Creek drainage. The cumulative impacts study area includes all areas in which planned or expected actions could cumulatively affect the resources within the study area.

Other than mining, present and past actions affecting soils stability, aquatic life, and wildlife in the area include, vehicle traffic near Clancy Creek, hunting, fishing, and general recreation. To date, these activities have had minimal overall effects on the resources in the area. No identified future actions are under current consideration by another state or federal agency within the cumulative impacts analysis area.

The relocation of Clancy Creek (proposed action) alternative would lead to a more long-term solution to the preservation of Clancy Creek water, which, would also improve soil stability, preserve downstream aquatics, and preserve wildlife habitat. The proposed action alternative and the past and reasonably foreseeable actions would cumulatively result in a minor and general improvement in the conditions of soils stability, aquatics, and wildlife habitat.

SECTION 4. Contributors

This EA was prepared by Dan Walsh of DEQ. Other DEQ staff, BLM staff, and FWP staff were consulted about the project.

SECTION 5. Need for Further Analysis and Significance of Potential Impacts

DEQ is required to determine the significance of the impacts to determine whether preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) is necessary. The criteria that DEQ is required to consider in making this determination are set forth in ARM 17.4.608 as follows:

1. The severity, duration, geographic extent, and frequency of the occurrence of the impact;
2. The probability that the impact will occur if the proposed action occurs; or conversely, reasonable assurance in keeping with the potential severity of an impact that the impact will not occur;
3. Growth-inducing or growth-inhibiting aspects of the impact, including the relationship or contribution of the impact to cumulative impacts;
4. The quantity and quality of each environmental resource or value that would be affected, including the uniqueness and fragility of those resources or values;
5. The importance to the state and to society of each environmental resource or value that would be affected;
6. Any precedent that would be set as a result of an impact of the proposed action that would commit DEQ to future actions with significant impacts or a decision in principle about such future actions; and
7. Potential conflict with local, state, or federal laws, requirements, or formal plans.

Amendment 009 for MTMI would impact the reclamation requirements for Clancy Creek and would affect the timing of removal of the shop building. Approximately 4 acres of land would be disturbed to accommodate the movement of Clancy Creek. The impacts of the Proposed Action are limited to the geographic extent of the permit boundary. Impacts on the resources evaluated range from no impact to minor impacts. Some of the impacts would be short-term and would be realized only during the construction phase to create a new Clancy Creek channel. There would be no undue or unnecessary degradation of resources.

DEQ has not identified any growth-inducing or growth-inhibiting aspects due to the reclamation plan update. DEQ's approval of a new reclamation plan does not set any precedent and would not commit DEQ to any future action with significant impacts, nor is it a decision in principle about any future actions that DEQ may act on. Finally, the reclamation plan update does not conflict with any local, state, or federal laws, requirements, or formal plans.

Based on consideration of all the criteria set forth in ARM 17.4.608, DEQ has determined that the proposed action will not significantly affect the human environment. Therefore, an EA is the appropriate level of environmental review and preparation of an EIS is not required.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS: _____

NO FURTHER ANALYSIS: _____ X

MORE DETAILED EA: _____