



Suzanne Steab < [suzannesteab@utah.gov](mailto:suzannesteab@utah.gov) >

---

## Fwd: Public outreach letter of February 20, 2012

1 message

---

**Daron Haddock** < [daronhaddock@utah.gov](mailto:daronhaddock@utah.gov) >

Mon, Apr 1, 2013 at 8:35 AM

To: Suzanne Steab < [suzannesteab@utah.gov](mailto:suzannesteab@utah.gov) >, "Strand, Howard" < [hstrand@osmre.gov](mailto:hstrand@osmre.gov) >, Priscilla Burton < [priscillaburton@utah.gov](mailto:priscillaburton@utah.gov) >

Forwarded FYI--

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bobbi Bryant** < [broncobobbi@gmail.com](mailto:broncobobbi@gmail.com) >

Date: Sat, Mar 30, 2013 at 9:26 AM

Subject: Public outreach letter of February 20, 2012

To: Daron Haddock < [daronhaddock@utah.gov](mailto:daronhaddock@utah.gov) >

Hi Daron - Here is my response to the letter. Thanks for allowing me the opportunity to provide my feedback and suggestions.

Bobbi Bryant

--

Daron R. Haddock

Coal Program Manager

Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

[\(801\) 538-5325](tel:(801)538-5325)



**DOGM annual report feedback 3.13.docx**

16K

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my thoughts and observations of permitting the strip coal mine adjacent to Bryce Canyon National Park.

My initial feelings, when this permitting process was beginning on the private land, was that no feedback, objections or concerns from the general public directly affected by the mine was being requested or considered. I still feel, to some degree, that this is the case. I must say, however, that Daron Haddock has been extremely helpful, responsive and considerate to each and every question or objection I have raised.

I did request a public hearing regarding this mine. It was held in Alton, UT. Kane County is the largest benefactor of this mine especially if it is approved for the adjacent BLM land. They are getting not only monies from the privately leased land, a new employer in a small hamlet that demographically never has had an employer and, if permitted, will reap tremendous benefits on the taxes Alton Coal Company will pay to the county for leasing the BLM land. Having the meeting in Alton was not a neutral meeting place. Those of us who objected to the mine felt like we were being thrown into the "lion's den". Also, those of us who were against the mine were required to speak first and those supporting the mine followed. Then Alton Coal Company was suppose to give their input into why this mine is important and answer questions from the floor. Their representative stood up and said he would not answer any question or make any presentations. To those of us attending felt that was a "red flag" regarding issues that were not being handled correctly or their inability to answer those questions. **If a mine is under consideration for permitting I feel that this must be a requirement of the company requesting the lease. They should not be able to deny the public the right to ask questions or express concerns to them directly.**

Since this was the **first strip coal mine** permitted in Utah extra steps should have been taken. A field trip should have been taken to adjoining states that have strip coal mines to discuss the issues, problems, successes, etc. that have come from these mines. Perhaps four different mine visits that have different corporate or associated ownership.

**All coal truck should be required to cover the coal as it is transported through our state.** This mine is situated in an area that affects multiple

open waterways. The location of the mine, itself, has required alterations to Kanab creek and other springs and creeks that flow into or out of this mine site, also, there are holding ponds for irrigation and stock watering and the Sevier River runs adjacent to the Highway 89 for several miles. There was no prior water testing done on these open waters and no ongoing testing being done (along the transportation route) to see if and what contamination is happening to these waters with the transport of coal in open containers. I do know that tests have been done in other states that have proven coal being transported by train or truck always results in contamination of water from either a minor degree to major concerns. DWQ told us in a meeting held in Panguitch that they did not have the funds, knowledge or equipment to monitor the water quality in the mining area and that **they would not** monitor the water in the river or the holding ponds. A mine should never be permitted if the state does not have the funds to protect the public

### **Impacts of residents and businesses along the transportation route.**

Several of us felt that any or all objections were falling on deaf ears regarding the noise and pollution generated by these trucks along the transportation route. I strongly believe that a committee should have been formed of elected officials from Kane and Garfield County, business owners and residents directly impacted by the additional truck traffic noise and other interested parties. This mine has been a negative impact for many of the businesses along the haul route (I am a business owner). I have heard or been subjected to comments regarding the noise these trucks make, their unsafe driving at a fast rate of speed on the highway, etc. With social media being what it is today word spreads quickly. Especially negative feedback. Besides the normal tire and asphalt debris we see from large trucks going through these small towns along Highway 89 we now are seeing and experiencing a fine black dust that adheres to our windows, interior displays and our lungs. Cover the trucks. Also, since the slide has closed Highway 89 south of Page, these numerous coal trucks and their noise are even more evident since most of the other large trucks have been forced to take alternative routes. Encouraging a more obscure or alternate route for hauling coal would have ideal. Tourism is our number one employer in Garfield County and we need to keep that economy strong and growing not weakening it. Guests that stay with us in our home comment about the noise all the time. Many motels have either seen decreases in business (one has closed) because of people checking out of their establishments in the

middle of the night as the truck noise is preventing them from sleeping, etc. When coming to our area people are here to visit national parks and national monuments not be subjected to noisy, dirty coal trucks.

I still do not know or understand exactly what was studied, discovered and addressed regarding the **impacts of wildlife, sage grouse, native vegetation, etc** in the area. I know the Utah Division of Wildlife has some major concerns regarding wildlife and sage grouse and raised several objections on the federal lands being considered for lease. A more thorough study should have been required and requested of those land owners, the coal mine company leasing the land and DOGM. Those findings should have been available to the general public to educate them and assure them that proper measures are being taken to protect same ie published in local newspapers, etc.

There are other concerns (highway vehicle safety, pollution of air and the negative health impacts on the elderly and young residents of adjacent areas, etc) but I feel I have addressed some major and ongoing concerns.

Again, thank you for giving me the opportunity to respond to this upcoming Annual Report.

Respectfully,

Bobbi Bryant  
PO Box 824  
Panguitch, UT 84759  
435.690.0044 office/cell