FRED C. HART ASSOCIATES, INC. • CONSULTANTS

MARKET CENTER • 1320 17TH STREET, DENVER, COLORADO 80202 • (303) 629-1818

November 15, 1982

Mr. Bennett Young
Office of Surface Mining
Western Technical Center
Brooks Tower, Second Floor
1020 Fifteenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202

Dear Ben,

As we discussed, I have attached a revised version of our Apparent Completeness Review (ACR) for the Price River Complex. The revisions are based upon information gained by our staff during the site visit on October 14, 1982.

Because the revisions were relatively minor, no amendment to the task order is necessary. However, this situation has demonstrated the value of site visits before ACR or other review work begins.

Appendix A (Cultural Resources) has not been revised, and therefore is not included in this revised version of our ACR.

I hope that this revised ACR is satisfactory. Please give us a call if you have any questions. We look forward to beginning the next phase of this task order.

Sincerely,

FRED C. HART ASSOCIATES, INC.

John J. Gaudette
Vice President

JJG/et

Enclosure

PRICE RIVER COAL COMPLEX
DETERMINATION OF APPARENT COMPLETENESS
FOR THE APPLICATION RESUBMITTAL

Listed by Utah Regulations

771.23 Permit Applications - General

Nowhere in the application is it clearly stated for which mines this application applies, and which mines are excluded. The applicant must supply a map showing the area covered by this permit term.

The applicant must provide a map showing where underground coal mining activities occurred both prior to and after August 3, 1977. Mining prior to, and after May 3, 1978; as well as prior to the approval of the regulatory program, and after the estimated date of issuance of a permit by the Division must also be shown.

782.13 Identification of Interests

Complete

782.14 Compliance Information

Complete

782.15 Right of Entry and Operation

Complete

782.16 Relationship to Areas Unsuitable for Mining

Complete

782.17 Permit Term

See comments under 771.23.

782.18 Personal Liability and Property

Complete

782.20 Public Office for Filing

Complete

782.21 Newspaper Advertisement

Complete

783.13 Hydrology/Geology Information

See comments under 783,14, 783.15, and 783.16.

783.14 Geology Description

The applicant must provide analyses for pyrite content of the coal as well as the stratum immediately above and below the coal. The information provided in Tables 6-1, 6-2, and 6-3 does not include pyrite.

Table 6-1 must include analyses of all nine target coal seams rather than the six presented.

783.15 Groundwater Information

Inadequacies in the description of the hydrogeologic system present at the Price River Mine Complex were a major topic of concern in the April, 1981, ACR. To date, these inadequacies have not been rectified. It is still unclear exactly how the mining sequence and surface disturbances proposed for the Price River Mine Complex relate to the groundwater system present in the area. The applicant needs to provide a more detailed description of the hydrogeology of the area, as requested initially in the original ACR. For example, piezometric contour maps have not been provided for the subsurface water bearing zone(s) eluded to in the text of the mine plan. The three geologic cross sections presented in Chapter VI of the application denote the presence of subsurface water, yet it is unclear, without a piezometric surface map, what the flow direction(s) and hydraulic gradient(s) are for the waterbearing zones identified. The applicant should also provide, at a minimum, in addition to the piezometric surface map:

- A specific description of the recharge and discharge areas for the waterbearing zones identified. Of related concern is the potential for hydraulic communication between the bedrock groundwater and the alluvial groundwater located along the principal drainages in the study area. It is conceivable that the alluvium could be a principal point of discharge for the deeper bedrock zones. If this potential for discharge to the alluvium is found to be present, it could have further importance in terms of assessing impacts to potential alluvial valley floors located along the principal drainages.

- A detailed description, including appropriate references, of the methodologies employed to determine hydraulic conductivities of the bedrock zones. At present, all that is known is that the applicant conducted "packer" tests, without any further detail on how the

tests were employed. A statement regarding the accuracy of the measurements (10^{-5} to 10^{-7} cm/sec) should also be provided.

- o A quantification of transmissivity values for the waterbearing zones present. Aquifer yield is a function of both saturated thickness and hydraulic conductivity. At present, an attempt has been made to estimate only hydraulic conductivity.

- o The elevations of the tops of the waterbearing zones present.

The applicant states on page I-3 of the introduction to the permit application that ". . .water accumulations in abandoned mine workings are substantial." This indicates that regulatory requests for additional groundwater information are justified, and that a more accurate projection of possible mine groundwater inflows by the applicant is necessary. This is important from an operational standpoint (e.g., how much mine water may be intercepted) as well as from an abandonment standpoint (e.g., will water enter the mine workings and subsequently degrade in quality). Also, if mine inflow were to occur following abandonment, the timing of groundwater discharges would be affected downgradient of the mine, and hence, a change in the water balance would be realized. In light of the fact that "substantial" accumulations of water have accumulated in abandoned mines in the area, the applicant must provide a more quantitative evaluation of potential groundwater impacts resulting from their mining sequence.

The applicant should identify the locations of the mine workings which have experienced the "substantial" mine inflow described above.

The applicant should provide a detailed identification, including a map, of known groundwater users in the area. If groundwater users are not identified, the applicant should clearly show the radius about the permit area utilized in the inventory.

The applicant provided a Water Quality Summary by Vaughn Hansen Associates as Appendix 7-A. Attachment 1 of that summary, which apparently discusses hydrologic evaluations of the Blackhawk Formation, was not included in the permit application. Please provide this document.

The hydrogeologic characteristics of the coal seams has not been discussed by the applicant. It is stated that the coal contains a relatively high moisture content. It is conceivable that the coal seams in the area serve as waterbearing zones, worthy of further characterization.

The applicant, on page 371, refers to a summary of hydrologic test results as being contained in Exhibit 6-12. No Exhibit 6-12 was found in the permit application. On page 372, it is stated that further monitoring is on-going. What is the nature of these further efforts? What is the timing and schedule for completion?

Groundwater Monitoring

The applicant has presented the results of past groundwater monitoring activities at the site which have taken place, under various programs, since 1977. It is apparent that the program has evolved during the time period 1977 to September 1981 (the latest date for which data was submitted) with the addition of some monitoring stations and the deletion of others. It is unclear which stations will be utilized for long term, future monitoring at the site. The applicant should explicitly identify which of the stations will be utilized for future activities.

The analytical parameter list has also gone through a number of modifications during the 1977 to 1981 period. The applicant should provide a statement confirming which set of parameters will be utilized for future monitoring activities, since the data provided to-date show that several lists have been utilized in the past.

Table 7-1 on page 370 of the permit application identifies groundwater monitoring stations, which the text of the application says are located on Figure 7-1. Four wells from Table 7-1, B-40, B-41, B-42, and B-43 are not located on Figure 7-1. Please identify the locations of these stations.

The water quality summary provided by Vaughn Hansen Associates (Appendix 7-A) does not identify depth to water (and hence, piezometric level) in the monitor wells at the time of sample collection. Is this information available? Such information is cruical to the applicant's contention on page 372 of the application that water levels have not been affected in the Blackhawk Formation by previous mining activities.

Also, the groundwater summary presented in Appendix 7-A identifies "flow (cfs)" as a measurment parameter for the wells. How was this parameter determined? Is it the extraction rate used for sample collection?

783.16 Surface Water Information

The applicant should provide a description of the design and construction of the surface water monitoring stations, including the type of flow gauges in use.

The applicant should identify the watershed areas for all the principal drainages which are located in the mine plan area. For example, the drainage areas for the Price River (above the downstream limit of the mine complex), Willow Creek, Hardscrabble Canyon, Sowbelly Gulch, Spring Canyon, Bear Canyon, Crandall Canyon, Sulfur Canyon Creek and Ford Creek should be provided.

At a minimum, long term mean annual yield for Willow Creek, Spring Canyon Creek and the Price River (the three perennial streams in the study area) should be provided. If such information is available for the non-perennial tributory drainages also, it should be provided.

The applicant needs to provide a discussion of NPDES discharges to the surface water resources in the area. What is the result of past NPDES monitoring activities conducted to-date?

783.17 Alternative Water Supply Information

As discussed in 783.14, the applicant needs to substantiate, via a detailed inventory, the locations of water users in the study area who may be potentially impacted by mining operations. The description should identify the distance from the permit area which was included in the inventory.

783.18 Climatological Information

Complete

783.19 Vegetation Information

The applicant's vegetation map should be revised to portray the locations of the proposed reference areas more distinctly. As presently shown, they are difficult to find. Additionally, the reference areas should be labelled on the map to correspond with the areas described in Section 3.3.

Tables 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6 are missing. They must be provided in order to present required baseline data for the mine plan area.

On the vegetation map, AVF's are illustrated with a line pattern. What does the dot pattern represent?

783.20

Although all species of fish and wildlife in the permit area that are of high interest or economic value have been discussed in the text of Section 10.1, a summary table listing each species by name would be helpful.

783.21 Soil Resources Information

In order to fully comply with this portion of the regulations, the applicant must provide the results of soil tests done for all materials to be used in restoring topsoil to each disturbed portion of the mine plan area. This information should supplement the soil test results for the Crandall Canyon area that are presented in Chapter VIII, Appendix B.

783.22 Land Use Information

The applicant has not provided a map which illustrates existing land uses within the proposed permit area.

The applicant has not provided a narrative describing the land's capability and productivity. This material must be provided and must address parts 783.22(a)(2)(i) and (ii) of the regulations.

The applicant must describe previous mining activities on site with respect to the criteria outlined in parts 783.22(b)(1)through (5) of this section of the regulations. Present references to the items required under this section are brief, general background statements which don't adequately address all five criteria in this section.

The applicant must describe any land use classifications of the permit area which exist under local law.

783.24 Maps - General

Nowhere in the application is it concisely stated for which mines and associated surface disturbances this application applies. It appears that the current permit area includes mines 3 and 5 and existing surface disturbances, as well as the Castle Gate preparation plant and associated refuse pile. If this is so, Exhibit 3-20, showing mining in the Panther mine area, should be revised to show the correct dates when mining will occur.

The applicant must provide a map showing all sub-areas where it is anticipated that additional permits will be sought.

A map showing the location and use of all buildings in the permit area as well as those within 1,000 feet of the permit area must be included.

The locations and boundaries of each of the proposed reference areas should be displayed more prominently on the vegetation map. As drawn, they are diffult to find.

783.25 Cross Sections, Maps, and Plans

All portals currently owned by Price River Coal Company (PRCC) for any portion of the operation must be identified. If portals are not used or sealed, their status should be identified.

Projections on the cross sections in the exhibits are too vast for practical use. For example, MC-53 is projected 5,100 feet from the north and MC-132 is projected 5,200 feet from the south onto cross-section A-A^1, thus resulting in a shift of nearly 2 miles.

The applicant must provide an illustration of the locations of monitoring stations designed to gather data on fish and wildlife.

Sufficient slope measurements must be provided as required by 783.25.

783.27 Prime Farmlands

Complete

784.11 Operating Plan

The location and areal extent of the topsoil storage area in Gravel Canyon must be shown on a map along with the surface water control structures.

784.12 Operating Plan: Existing Structures

Information for each of the existing structures utilized by PRCC must be provided as required by this part. In particular, the stability of any cuts and fills in the surface facilities areas must be identified; as well as areas where mine development waste, and shaft construction waste is, or has been, disposed of.

In the narrative description of the Willow Creek facilities (p. 164, Section 3.6 of the permit application), the applicant discusses the failure potential for embankments, including piping and tension cracks. Some elaboration of this discussion is necessary: 1) which dike has failed, and was it repaired, and 2) have remedial measures been effective?

784.13 Reclamation Plan: General Requirements

The applicant must provide information on measures to be taken if temporary closure becomes necessary as required by 817.131.

The applicant should define the boundaries of the proposed permit area (see 771.23).

The amount of proposed bond must include the cost for grading of the refuse pile and reclamation of the pile, for the worst case situation, if the site is abandoned prior to complete pile construction. In addition, the closure costs for each of the portals must be estimated in more detail along with building removal costs. References are available which provide reasonable data to make a more detailed estimate.

The specific dates anticipated for reclamation of the disturbed areas must be noted for all distubances in the permit area, for each major step of the reclamation process.

Plans and cross-sections must be submitted showing the existing and final surface configuration of all areas disturbed by mining. Cross-sections of

the sites are the only way to ensure that the disturbed areas are being returned to the most stable configuration reasonably possible.

Specific plans should be provided showing how each portal and shaft will be closed to insure that the design is adequate for each particular setting. Consideration of potential hydraulic heads on portal seals subsequent to closure must be taken into account, especially given the fact that the old workings are flooded.

The applicant has indicated that the sedimentation ponds are numbered according to their NPDES permits. A list is given on p. 48, Sec. 2.7 in the permit application that includes three NPDES permits. The narratives given in Chapter 3 and information located on exhibits 3.2-1, 3.3-1, 3.4-1 and 3.6-1 indicates that there are at least eight existing sediment ponds, a minimum of three proposed ponds and numerous, undescribed structures called sedimentation basins. The applicant must: 1) Explain why there are not more NPDES permits; 2) Supply a more complete list of NPDES permits if possible 3) Provide a narrative of the requirements (monitoring and efficient limitations) attached to the NPDES permits for each discharge point and 4) Provide a thorough discussion of any violations of NPDES effluent limitation requirements that may have occurred at any existing pond (or basin) and the remedial measures that have been implemented or proposed to correct the violations.

784.14 Reclamation Plan: Protection of Hydrologic Balance

The applicant must clearly indicate where all the sediment and sludge cleaned from every sediment pond or basin in the permit area is being disposed of.

Throughout Chapter 3 of the permit application, the applicant mentions that small area exemptions from sedimentation ponds are being requested. In order to evaluate these requests, the applicant must locate these areas on Exhibits 3.2-1, 3.3-1, 3.4-1 and 3.6-1. Additionally, acreages of the small area exemption requests should be provided in every case and the

applicant should explain the alternative sediment controls that will be used in those areas.

The applicant has designed sedimentation ponds based on a sediment value derived initially from the USLE on pages 401-409, Chapter 7 of the permit application. Several questions arose during the review of this methodology:

(1)

On p. 401, the applicant states that precipitation varies from 10 to 20 inches across the permit area. This fact is later used to support the contention that the sediment derivation for Crandall Canyon is a worst case analysis since that area receives the highest amount of rainfall. The applicant should discuss why Crandall Canyon was used as a worst case solely on the basis of precipitation since the R factor for the entire mine is 40 anyway and is not particularly affected by precipitation amount at the mine site according to Figure 1 of the permit application. In other words, could there be other areas of the mine that are yielding larger sediment contributions to ponds based on parameters other than precipitation that are factored into the Universal Soil Loss Equation?

(2)

According to the USLE calculations on p. 405 presented as an example for arriving at the typical sediment contribution, .016 acre feet per acre per year could be expected as a "worst case". According to 817.46(1), annual sediment volumes calculated via the USLE or an equivalent methodology must be tripled to arrive at the required pond sediment storage volume. In this case, that requirement would dictate a sediment storage volume of .048 acre feet (.016 acre ft./acre/years x 3 years). This would contradict the applicant's argument presented on p. 409 of the permit application that the calculated sediment contribution is less than .035 acre feet/acre. Therefore, the applicant should re-evaluate the use of .035 acre feet/acre as a conservative estimate and supply supporting data for the chosen methodology.

The applicant has sized all the sedimentation ponds based on the storm run-off and the sediment contribution. These quantities are presented in tables in Chapter 3 of the permit application under the respective surface facilities areas. These tables appear to be incorrect. For example, on p. 117 of the permit application, Table 3.2-4(B) presents the volumes used to size the ponds for mine site 5. It appears that the runoff from disturbed areas during a 25-year storm was added to the runoff from disturbed areas during a 10-year storm to get the total runoff volume for a 25-year event. This type of error was consistent throughout all the calculations for pond sizes presented in the permit application. The applicant must correct all of these and provide a new evaluation of pond sizes.

The applicant must provide a clear explanation of structures scattered throughout the surface facilities that are referred to as sedimentation basins and for which no design data was supplied. What distinguishes a sedimentation basin from a sedimentation pond? According to UMC 700.5, a sedimentation pond is also on excavated depression, as well as a barrier or dam. The applicant should provide a good definition of sedimentation basins as utilized at this mine site and provide plans, cross-sections and calculations for each existing and proposed structure.

784.15 Reclamation Plan: Post Mining Land Use

The applicant must indicate what type of support activities will be required to achieve the proposed post mining land use.

The applicant should evaluate the compatibility of the proposed land use with any existing or proposed surface water plans, and with any applicable State and local land use plans.

Comments submitted to the applicant by owners of the affected lands should be summarized by the applicant.

784.16 Reclamation Plan: Ponds and Banks

An inspection plan must be provided to meet the requirements of 816.71(j).

A detailed geotechnical analysis must be provided which shows the stability of the refuse pile setting pond embankment structure. This analysis must incorporate consideration of the following factors: 1) an analysis of the effects of the water flowing through the embankment, the anticipated phreatic surface must be identified; 2) the stability of the foundation material and the potential for seepage through the foundation.

Maintenance requirements for the embankment structure at the refuse pile settling pond must be identified.

The applicant has assumed that discharge structures are not required for some ponds that can retain the sediment and runoff from a 25-year storm event. According to UMC 817.46(d), every sedimentation pond (which includes excavated depressions per UMC 700.5) must be provided with a "non-clogging dewatering device or a conduit spillway approved by the Division". The applicant must upgrade existing sedimentation ponds to conform with this part of Subchapter K, and provide discharge structures for all proposed sedimentation ponds. The submitted information should include: plans, cross-sections, calculations and methodology used to design the discharge structure (refer to UMC 817.46(g)(i)).

The applicant has provided locations for the majority of sedimentation ponds on Exhibit 3.2-1 (Sowbelly Gulch), 3.3-1 (Hardscrabble Canyon), 3.4-1 (Castle Gate and Utah Fuels #1) and 3.6-1 (Willow Creek). There have not been any usable plans or cross-sections, however, save for a few insufficient cross-sections provided in Exhibit 3.2-2. An analysis of sediment pond adequacy requires that the following items be submitted for each existing and proposed sediment pond:

- Outlines of the drainage areas to each pond shown on the above exhibits.

- o A plan view map for each pond or cross-sections through the entire structure to be used for calculating available storage; a cross-section of each embankment used to construct a sedimentation pond that is to-scale, showing the top-width, height, side slopes and spillway locations; typical cross-sections or plan views of the principal and/or emergency spillways from which dimensions can be obtained; calculations showing that the emergency spillway is capable of adequately passing the run-off (keyed into peak flows in Table 7.5) from a 25 year-24 hour storm event alone or in conjunction with the principal spillway; placement of erosion controls.

On Exhibit 3.4-1, the applicant shows proposed sedimentation ponds 27A and 27B. The explanation for these ponds is presented on p. 146 of the permit application. The applicant should present a drainage area map that clearly shows how runoff formerly routed to ponds 011 and 012 will flow into these proposed ponds.

On p. 116 of the permit application, the applicant explains that three sedimentation ponds in the Sowbelly Gulch area are connected via an 18-inch corrugated metal pipe. What purpose does this serve? The volume analysis for these ponds should be re-evaluated to show that each pond is capable of storing the runoff and sediment from its designated drainage area.

784.16

The applicant should specify what the final design of the refuse disposal site will be and which of the design suggestions that Golder Assoc. has made have been utilized in the construction of the refuse pile. The following specific information is required.

- o An estimate of the quality of the water draining from the refuse material during spring runoff must be made to assess potential hydrologic impacts.

- Details must be provided on the analyses utilized to determine safety factors including an evaluation of the material properties of the refuse related to stability.

- The applicant should ensure that that the refuse material will be compacted to 95% of the maximum dry density.

- An inspection program must be developed showing compliance with 817.82.

- A materials handling plan should be provided showing the volume of material to be removed, stockpiled and replaced to achieve the required 4 feet of cover and required topsoil during various stages of construction. Otherwise, tests must be performed to substantiate that a lesser amount of cover will support vegetation.

- The applicant is required by 817.81 to comply with 817.71, 72, and 73. As such, the applicant is required to construct a sub-drainage system. A plan must be submitted showing compliance with this requirement.

- All plans for the design of the refuse pile must be certified by a registered professional engineer.

- The applicant must specify if any of the thickener underflow will be disposed of at the refuse pile site.

784.17 Protection of Public Parks and Historic Places

See comments in Attachment A

784.18 Public Roads

Complete

784.19 Underground Development Waste

See comments under 784.16

784.20 Subsidence Control Plan

The applicant must provide justification that the Castle Gate Sandstone is capable of subsiding without cracking and as such will not cause surface cracking in areas where structures and renewable resources exist. An analysis should be provided relating subsidence in mined out areas to the percent of coal extracted in those areas. A relationship between coal extraction, seam depths, seam thicknesses and subsidence can be made which could be utilized to predict anticipated subsidence in longwall areas and areas where first mining will occur.

It appears that the subsidence control points utilized in subsidence monitoring are located over previous mining and within the angle of draw of adjacent mining. The applicant must provide data showing that all measurements were made from points unaffected by mining.

The table provided on subsidence data collected to date is mostly unreadable. A readable table must be provided.

784.21 Fish and Wildlife Plan

Specific information must be provided concerning how the applicant intends to protect or enhance threatened or endangered species of plants or animals in the permit areas, protected species of wildlife in the area, and habitats of unusually high value which may occur in the permit area.

784.22 Diversions

The applicant should locate the typical channel cross-sections for the Schoolhouse Canyon Refuse Pile diversion (Figure 5-3 of the Golder Report)

on a plan view of the diversion, so that an evaluation of velocities in various segments of the channel is possible.

On p. 5-4 of the Golder Report, a statement is made implying that some portions of the diversion might be constructed in unconsolidated material. This would be an unfavorable situation where the diversion makes a 90-degree swing to the northwest. Therefore, erosion controls must be placed at that juncture or the applicant should demonstrate that the bend in the diversion will be excavated in rock.

In Chapter 7, on Table 7.5, the applicant has presented peak flow calculations that could be used to size the existing and proposed ditches and culverts at the surface facilities areas. The applicant should confirm that these flows were indeed used for that purpose, then supply calculations showing that each diversion and culvert to be utilized during this permit term is capable of adequately passing its assigned peak flow. This could be handled via a table showing the Manning's Equation parameters utilized for each ditch design, its applicable Q-value and resulting velocity. A similar table could be used for each culvert, showing its required Q (again, from Table 7-5) and the designed pipe diameter. A typical cross-section for the ditches could be acceptable, providing that special cases were also provided with cross-sections. These calculations and cross-sections should be keyed into the appropriate plan view map (Exhibit 3.2-1, 3.3-1, 3.4-1 and 3.6-1).

Unless surface water monitoring data proves that these are ephemeral streams, longitudinal profiles should be provided for the larger stream channel diversions, such as Sowbelly Gulch showing pre-construction conditions (if available) existing conditions and proposed restoration.

784.23 Operations Plan: Maps and Plans

The applicant has made a statement that berms are constucted around the surface facilities at the mine (p. 413 Chapter II) as an integral part of controlling runoff from disturbed areas. These berm locations should be

shown on Exhibits 3.2-1, 3.3-1, 3.4-1 and 3.6-1 so that a realistic evaluation of surface water control can be made. It is not possible to look at the exhibits and determine where runoff is flowing unless these berm locations are clearly shown on the exhibits.

The small sumps mentioned on p. 114 of the permit application should be shown on Exhibit 3.2-1.

The culverts proposed for the access road in the Sowbelly Gulch area mentioned on p. 114 should be located on Exhibit 3.2-1. Associated plans and calculations should also be submitted.

The applicant should provide stationing on the plan view lines of sedimentation pond cross-sections shown on the surface facilities maps so that some correspondence can be made between those plan views and the cross-sections on Exhibit 3.2-2.

The area of land for which the performance bond will be posted must be identified.

Areas where underground development waste has been disposed of must be identified.

784.24 Transportation Facilities

Detailed descriptions of all roads to be used by the applicant have not been provided. This matter was mentioned in the previous ACR; but, because all the roads--except for the Crandall Canyon access road--to be used by the applicant are very old mining roads and County roads throughout the permit area, it would be impractical for the applicant to provide design data on all of them. Unless others in the regulatory authority have reason for this data, the applicant's submittals should suffice.

Detailed descriptions and drawings have not been provided for conveyors and rail systems as requires by this section.

784.25 Return of Coal Processing Waste

N/A

784.26 Air Pollution Control Plan

Complete

785.13 Experimental Practices

N/A

785.17 Prime Farmlands

Complete

785.19 Alluvial Valley Floors

The applicant has requested a determination by the State of Utah DOGM regarding the presence of Alluvial Valley Floors. Until consultation with the Utah DOGM has been completed, no questions regarding AVF's (which would require response from the applicant) are appropriate at this time.

785.21 Coal Plant Not in Mining Plan Area

N/A

785.22 In-Situ Processing

N/A

785.11 Public Notice of Filing

Complete

786.25 Permit Term

Complete

800.11 Filing Bond

Complete

800.12 Liability Insurance

Complete

805.11 Determination of Bond

See comments under 784.13.

A breakdown of how bonding cost was computed should be compiled to a single breakdown table itemizing areas of reclamation with manpower and machinery as well as materials required.

805.13 Period of Liability

Complete

806.11 Form of Bond

Complete

806.14 Terms of Liability Insurance

Complete

817.11 Signs and Markers

The applicant has provided signs and marker information for the Crandall Canyon site only. This information must be provided for all of the permit area and applicable mines.

The remainder of applicable 817 series regulations have been referenced in the previous 783 and 784 series discussions.