

March 17, 1986

TO: Technical File

FROM: James S. Leatherwood, Reclamation Soils Specialist

RE: NOV Review N85-2-12-1, Item No. 4, Sediment Pond Soil Substitute Soil Determination, Belina Complex, Valley Camp of Utah, ACT/007/001, Folder No. 3 and 7, Carbon County, Utah

SUMMARY

The applicant has submitted sufficient data for the determination of the sediment pond soil as a potential substitute topsoil. The Division has determined that this material is a suitable substitute topsoil material. This decision is based on Bookcliff laboratories data, submitted March 4, 1986.

BODY

The following parameters were equated to the Division suitability limits for rating topsoil substitutes:

<u>PARAMETER</u>	<u>DATA</u>	<u>DIVISION RATING*</u>
pH	7.9	Fair
	7.8	Good
Texture	S	Good
	SL	Good
Electrical Conductivity	0.95	Good
	2.38	Good
Sodium Adsorption Ratio	0.81	Good
	4.85	Good
Saturation Percentage	3.7	Good
	3.6	Good
Alkalinity	8.2	Good
	2.8	Good

The sediment pond soil material overall rating has been determined good.

*Table 2, DOGM Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden.

jvb
cc: W. Hedberg
D. Wham
0437R-17

FILE COPY

See 3-12
 I know Jim is probably swamped, but do you think he could follow up on this NOV which EV H. worked on? I've have tried to include all background correspondence. TX.
 *Please return correspondence to Wayne

DWH

MRP REVISION/NOV TRACKING FORM
 (Revised: 3/28/85)

Type of Proposal: X COAL NONCOAL

Exploration
X NOV/CO Abatement, NOV # NBS-2-12-1, Abatement Deadline Sept 1/85 Plans due
 MRP Revision #1 of 1
 MRP Amendment

Issuing Inspector Sandy Pruitt

Title of Proposal: Abatement plans to address unpermitted enlargement of sed. pond.

Company name: Valley Camp of Utah Project/ Mine Name: Belina Mine / Utah #2 loadout

File # (PRO/ACT): 007/001 Disturbed (Fed/State/Fee): 1 1 1
 (CEP/EXP) Acres

Assigned Reviewers:	Review Time (hrs):	OTHER AGENCIES: (# of copies & date)
(Hydrology) <u>TJS</u>	<u>1.0</u>	OSM (1)
(Wildlife/Veg.)		USFS
(Engineering)		BLM
(Soils) <u>EV Hooper's Desk Nov 12/9/85</u>		Health
(Geology)		History
		H2O Rts
		Wildlife

- DATES: USFWS _____
- (a) Initial Plan Received Aug 15/85 (d) Optr. Resubmission March 6/86
 Tech Review Due Aug 30/85 Tech Review Due March 21/86
 Tech Review Complete _____ Tech Review Complete _____
 DOGM Response Sent _____ DOGM Response Sent _____
 - (b) Operator Resubmission Aug 29/85 (e) Bond Revised _____
 Tech Review Due Sept 11/85 Amount (\$) _____
 Tech Review Complete (*) Tech Review Complete _____
 DOGM Response Sent _____ DOGM Response Sent _____
 - (c) Operator Resubmission Sept 12/85 (f) Cond'l. Approval _____
 Tech Review Due Sept 23/85* Stipulations Due _____
 Tech Review Complete _____ Stips Received _____
 Deficient DOGM Response Sent Dec 20/85* Final Approval _____
 - (g) MR-9 Received _____
 MR-9 Acknowledged _____

(partial response)
 2 copies maps sent
 (2 maps per set)
 writing on complete plan
 submission prior to
 completing tech review
 7 copies Revised maps
 + plans

COMMENTS: REQUESTED ADDITIONAL DATA RELATING TO ITEM # 4 OF NOV CONCERNING SUBSIDIARY SUBSOIL MATERIAL DEC/20/85

NOTE (INSPECTORS): Please attach a copy of the NOV issued to the abatement plan when received from the operator.

NOTE (REVIEWERS): Please prepare review comments in a format referencing the appropriate regulation or statute. State the deficiency as well as the minimum requirement necessary to demonstrate compliance. Fill in the # of hours spent in review by discipline. Return completed form to the Special Permits Supervisor when complete.

dy DMW