

ACT/007/004

0013

PRICE RIVER COAL COMPANY
P.O. BOX 629 HELPER, UTAH 84526 (801) 472-3411

October 12, 1982

CERTIFIED MAIL NO. 3968242
Return Receipt Requested

Mr. Tom Tetting
PRCC Plan Lead Reviewer
Utah Department of Natural Resources
Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining
4241 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Dear Tom:

Please find attached a copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on October 5, 1982, in PRCC offices concerning modification to the refuse pile in Schoolhouse Canyon. I feel that we have recorded all comments accurately. Should you take exception, please notify me of the error.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

R. L. Wiley
R. L. Wiley
Environmental Engineer

RLW:ga

Attachment

- cc: K. Hutchinson
- E. Haub
- F. Pero
- D. Stephens

RECEIVED
OCT 20 1982

DIVISION OF
OIL, GAS & MINING

PRICE RIVER COAL COMPANY

P.O. BOX 629 HELPER, UTAH 84526 (801) 472-3411

October 5, 1982

MINUTES OF MEETING WITH PRCC AND DOGM HELD IN PRCC'S OFFICE ON 9/28/82

In Attendance:

PRCC: Robert Wiley, Eugene Haub, Frank Pero, Don Stephens

DOGM: Tami Balkenbush, Cy Young, Lynn Kunzler, Joe Lyons, Everett Hooper, Tom Tetting

Meeting was called to order at 11:35 A.M.

The meeting was held after a site viewing to discuss requirements for modifications for PRCC's existing refuse pile at Schoolhouse Canyon to increase capacity.

WILEY: We have considered three different schemes for refuse pile increase: 1) Raising the final pile elevation by 200' using the same face slope. This might provide an additional 15 years storage. 2) Raising final pile elevation by 100', which would require re-cutting of the present diversion at a higher elevation. 3) Using a side stacking configuration against the south wall of Schoolhouse Canyon.

TETTING: On what rate of refuse generation and coal production has or will pile life be based?

WILEY: Calculations for future storage can only be based on projected production. Production is controlled by the coal market and available capital for investment in new equipment. Originally, we projected a life of the present refuse pile to be 7 years, starting in 1977. This life of facility was based on an estimated increase in production to 1.6 million tons in 1978 and 3.5 million by 1984. This rate of increase has not occurred, due to the loss of the No. 3 Mine longwall and a generally poor coal market. At current and projected production, we may now have a life in the existing refuse pile design to 1988 or 1990. Projected life of the pile increase is more a matter of speculation than of fact. We will, however, try to make an estimate.

HAUB: Will this affect the mine plan now in processing?

TETTING: Yes, it will affect it. Yes and no. Final review should be completed by submittal date next April.

MINUTES OF MEETING WITH PRCC AND DOGM HELD
IN PRCC'S OFFICE ON 9/28/82
October 5, 1982
Page Two

- WILEY: You have six months to review once plans are submitted. Will this be sufficient?
- TETTING: Yes.
- KUNZLER: Yes, that's about how long it has been taking.
- WILEY: What comments do you have on our proposed time schedule for permitting, etc., in the letter of 8/30/82?
- TETTING: Timing seems good.
- WILEY: We have listed the items we are looking at, both for our purposes and yours, in the letter of 8/30 - if we can use that letter as an outline and go over it - can you add anything to geotechnical information needed? Don Stephens is taking care of geology. The area is pretty stable with a lot of rock coming close to the surface. The important point is whether we can stack the refuse higher and maintain stability.
- TETTING: We're concerned about water underneath causing loss of stability.
- WILEY: We are certainly concerned about the water. We must try to keep the drainage from getting into material. Piezometers were installed in face. We use the wells as survey points. We've observed no movement so far. The base of pile getting closer to bedrock all the time.
- YOUNG: You might want to include projected mining in any and all longwalls in that canyon for a structural concern. Additional plans may be needed.
- STEPHENS: We have to deal with that in any case; the excess weight and cover. It doesn't matter from a mining standpoint.
- YOUNG: It should be included anyhow.
- WILEY: Are there any projections regarding longwalling in that area?
- STEPHENS: We are not going to be longwalling. We can check and make sure. No problem if longwall mining north of the refuse site.
- WILEY: It is something to consider.
- YOUNG: Put that in if you are not going to be mining.
- WILEY: We want to stay back with any longwall on a 45° angle of draw along Price Canyon and Willow Creek.

MINUTES OF MEETING WITH PRCC AND DOGM HELD
IN PRCC'S OFFICE ON 9/28/82
October 5, 1982
Page Three

WILEY: Any comments on hydrological considerations?

LYONS: Some kind of erosion control structures for diversion. The size of it shows that it is really a distribution pond and not a diversion ditch.

WILEY: That particular method was approved when we constructed it. Is there any problem now with the ditch?

LYONS: Not if it is properly sized. Nothing I would consider important.

WILEY: It is sized for 100 year storm - plus. Golder Associates designed it for the Olympic Peninsula rather than Utah, I think. The size can carry 500-600 cfs. It's in the Golder plan.

TETTING: There is an under-drain now?

WILEY: Yes.

TETTING: Where does that end up?

PERO: The under-drain is extremely wide. There is quite a substantial length of pipe to take it into that structure; a 6" or 8" perforated pipe. The drain ends in the pond.

TETTING: Did you include a letter explaining its presence in the submittal?

LYONS: The plan is pretty explicit.

WILEY: Any other hydrological consideration we want to talk about at this time, Joe?

LYONS: No, I don't think so at this moment.

TETTING: Are you planning on going above the existing diversion?

WILEY: In one scheme, yes.

TETTING: Doesn't that run into the rock wall?

WILEY: No. There is sufficient area below the cliff for the diversion. We have considered going under the pile using the existing diversion for installation of a reinforced concrete culvert. We have even considered a rock tunnel through the mountain.

LYONS: Can alternative drainage be on the other side of canyon?

WILEY: Considering we can't take the diversion around the south, we will bring it back to the culvert or into a higher ditch in the 100' increase scheme. There is no particular reference to this in the Golder plan - we will study it.

MINUTES OF MEETING WITH PRCC AND DOGM HELD
IN PRCC'S OFFICE ON 9/28/82
October 5, 1982
Page Four

- WILEY: Any comments on wildlife information?
- KUNZLER: I think habitat information could be derived from the vegetation study. Any critical habitat in the upper portion? Any federal or state designated species of high interest?
- WILEY: Refer to Exhibit 10.1 of the map supplement.
- KUNZLER: It has probably been done; just a matter of making reference to it. I can see the high probability of doing a raptor and migratory bird survey of this area. Consider high interest federal species.
- WILEY: That would be raptors? Certainly no ducks that high. What would we expect to find that high, except raptors?
- KUNZLER: Some are listed in our wildlife guidelines; for instance, the Western Bluebird and some of those.
- WILEY: Oh, really?
- KUNZLER: Any drainage is only ephemeral and so the habitat doesn't exist for many others.
- TETTING: The alternative proposal should be developed and listed in such detail to make it clear enough to all those concerned that this is the best alternative economically feasible. Economic considerations should be stressed. A brief economic projection.
- WILEY: Do you mean costs of similar pile somewhere else?
- KUNZLER: I will check with DWR and F&WL to make sure they are aware and will put together a formal guideline to what should be done and the survey that needs to be done.
- WILEY: I would like to get a statement as far as habitat and raptor, archaeological/historical considerations.
- WILEY: Any comments on historical/archaeological considerations?
- KUNZLER: We may have to contact SHPO. There should be no problem up that high?
- HAUB: I have been up above and I don't think there is anything up there.
- PERO: There is zip.
- WILEY: Everything has to be signed off by all agencies; we have come to understand this.

MINUTES OF MEETING WITH PRCC AND DOGM HELD
IN PRCC'S OFFICE ON 9/28/82
October 5, 1982
Page Five

WILEY: Any comments on topsoil resources?

HOOPER: Write up a statement of conditions. It's mostly rock - topsoil is probably not recoverable. Highly unlikely.

WILEY: Do you need any tests; any analysis?

HOOPER: Not if you are not going to save any; it may not be possible. I don't think you can do much with it.

HAUB: There is no way you can save it. It is not logical.

HOOPER: We will talk to OSM. If you can't pick up topsoil, just explain why.

HAUB: It could be dangerous to men and equipment to remove soil on such steep slopes. It's a safety problem. You could kill a man. If that happens, who is right if you make us try to pick up topsoil?

WILEY: Any comments on maps and plans?

BALKEN-
BUSH: The list looks pretty good. It is briefly what we need. I can't think of anything else other than what is in this list.

WILEY: Any other engineering information?

BALKEN-
BUSH: Just geotechnical stability and analysis.

WILEY: The most significant portion of this plan is engineering information. Any additional comments on overall plan?

BALKEN-
BUSH: Can you continue access road as you have it?

HAUB: Only as far as it is now.

WILEY: There is no room further for access on north side of canyon. We will zig-zag up the face as shown in the Golder plan.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 P.M.

An additional comment was included by a phone call from Tom Tetting on 9/30/82. Mr. Tetting suggested that we include reclamation cost information for the additional area.