

VALLEY CAMP OF UTAH, INC.

Scofield Route
Helper, Utah 84526

21 September 1981

Jim
Copy to Sally,
EV & Tam T.,
& Sue

RECEIVED
JIM
SEP 22 1981
OCT 01 1981

DIVISION OF
OIL, GAS & MINING

Mr. Ronald W. Daniels
Deputy Director
Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
1588 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

RE: Topsoil Exchange

Dear Mr. Daniels:

Pursuant to your approval letter of August 21, 1981, in which Valley Camp of Utah, Inc., was given permission to utilize approximately 6,000 cubic yards of excess topsoil material, produced at the Skyline Minesite, in continued re-vegetation efforts, please find enclosed one (1) copy of a Soils Analysis report which I believe will fulfill the requirements of Stipulation 8-19-1.

As far as Stipulation 8-19-2 is concerned, we anticipate spreading the material as it is taken from Skyline's stockpile and do not foresee the need to stockpile any material within our permit area for either short or long term durations. As of this date, we are planning to commence re-distribution some time in November.

The material will be placed by pushing the material uphill with a Bulldozer, and will be applied to a depth of 3 to 6 inches. By using a Bulldozer to apply the material, we can utilize the tracks in planting and retaining of moisture. Upon completion of the topsoil re-distribution, the prepared areas will be seeded and covered with either straw or some other type mulch, which will provide wind and erosion protection.

8-19-3
←

Unless otherwise notified, we will proceed with this project in the manner just described.

Sincerely,

T. G. Whiteside
Senior Mining Engineer

Copy to: Vernal J. Mortensen - w/o enclosure

Enclosure

ANALYSIS OF TOPSOIL ACQUIRED FOR RECLAMATION PURPOSES BY VALLEY CAMP OF
UTAH

Prepared for: Mr. Trevor Whiteside
Valley Camp of Utah, Inc.

Prepared by: ENDANGERED PLANT STUDIES, INC.
129 North 1000 East
Orem, Utah 84057
(801) 225-7085

Date: 15 September 1981

ANALYSIS OF TOPSOIL ACQUIRED FOR RECLAMATION PURPOSES
BY VALLEY CAMP OF UTAH

SOIL COMPARISON

The topsoil acquired by Valley Camp to use in their reclamation program is adequately similar to the original soil and is considered excellent for reclamation purposes. The soil comes from an area which previously supported an aspen vegetation community and will be used to reclaim an aspen community site. The topsoil gathering site is located about one mile north of the reclamation site where it is to be used.

The original soil had a sandy clay loam texture. This will be replaced with soils having the same texture or with 3 to 6 percent less clay. This difference will cause no visible or unmanageable changes.

Following is a table which compares the major soils in question and a table which supplies the laboratory data and analysis of the topsoil materials.

COMPARISON OF SOILS*

PARAMETER	PREVIOUS TOPSOIL (Map Unit F)	REPLACING TOPSOIL (Map Unit G)
Taxonomic Classification	60% fine-loamy, mixed Argic Pachic Cryoborolls 30% loamy-skeletal, mixed Argic Cryoborolls	Coarse-loamy, mixed mixed Pachic Cryoborolls
Surface Texture	Loam to fine sandy loam	Loam to fine sandy loam
Slopes	35-50% western aspect	35-50% southern aspect

*For further comparison see September 1980 report, pp. 19-20 and 73-75.

LABORATORY INFORMATION

% N	.0615	ppm P	30.9
ppm K	95.5	ppm Ca	2375
ppm Mg	187.5	ppm Na	10.5
ppm Zn	1.84	ppm Fe	46.3
ppm Mn	10.4	ppm Cu	0.49
% O.M.	4.77	pH	7.3
ECX10 ³	0.76	SAR	0.12
ppm NO ₃ -N	5.7	% moist.	29.5
% sand	56.9	% silt	27.3
% clay	15.8	Texture Class	Sandy clay loam

Soil samples were taken mid-slope, at 8 to 14 inches depth, then combined.

LABORATORY ANALYSIS

The topsoil in question does not have any appreciable amount of toxic metals. There is a neutral pH. Salts are not a problem. There is a high organic matter content to enhance vegetation growth. There is adequate P and K fertilizer nutrients, if revegetation suggestions are applied.