

0011



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangarter
Governor
Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

TO: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Paul Baker, Reclamation Biologist 

DATE: February 19, 1993

RE: Second Submittal of Responses to Permit Renewal Technical Deficiency Review, Coastal States Energy and Skyline Coal Companies, Skyline Mines, ACT/007/005, Folder #2, Carbon County, Utah

SUMMARY

Skyline has submitted responses to the review of the initial response to the permit renewal technical deficiency review. Some of the remaining deficiencies dealt with comments from land owners on the postmining land use and right of entry information. They have asked for a delay until May 3, 1993, to respond to some of the deficiencies.

ANALYSIS

R645-301-322

Wildlife Information

Original Deficiency:

1. *Changes to the high interest species status of red bats and western smooth green snakes need to be made in Tables 2.9-1 and 2.9-3.*

Response and Analysis:

The appropriate changes have been made in these tables.

Deficiencies:

None.

Original Deficiency:

2. *The plan must include data from recent Wildlife Resources fisheries surveys.*

Response and Analysis:

The response letter states that recent fish surveys would reflect the results of constant blockage by an irrigation diversion and by beaver dams. Also, the tributaries of Scofield Reservoir were recently poisoned. Any recent DWR fisheries surveys would not provide meaningful data on mining-related impacts.

There have been impacts to the fish population of Eccles Creek besides those from Skyline just as there have been impacts to water quality besides those that Skyline has made. The requirement was made using the same basic rationale as is used for conducting water quality sampling: when there are perturbations in the fish populations, causes can be analyzed and solutions sought.

As required by R645-301-322.100, this deficiency was written after consultation with Wildlife Resources. The requirement should not be burdensome since the information is available from DWR. However, effects on the fish population of Eccles Creek are considered to be potential impacts of the mine, and baseline information needs to be contained in the plan.

Deficiencies:

1. The plan must include data from recent Wildlife Resources fisheries surveys.

R645-301-230

Mulching Techniques.

Original Deficiency:

1. *The plan needs to contain a method for anchoring straw mulch.*

Response and Analysis:

The plan states on page 4-38 that all mulch will be anchored by chemical tackifiers or crimping.

Deficiencies:

None.

**R645-301-341.300
R645-301-413**

**Revegetation Feasibility Demonstration.
Land Use Reclamation Plan.**

The deficiencies outlined above need to be reconciled. It may be advisable to continue these deficiencies in a separate Division Order or to somehow stipulate that they be resolved.

Deficiencies:

R645-301-341.300 Revegetation Feasibility Demonstration.

1. The Operator must demonstrate that areas of the conveyor bench and associated cut slopes are reclaimable according to the plans presented in the mining and reclamation plan. As an alternative to the current plan, Skyline may consider changing the postmining land use for this area.

R645-301-413 Land Use Reclamation Plan.

1. The right of entry information for the land at the loadout must be updated in the plan in accordance with R645-301-114.100.
2. The plan must include comments concerning the postmining land use from the land owners of the conveyor corridor.

R645-301-413 Land Use Reclamation Plan.

Original Deficiency:

3. *The cross reference must show the locations of surface owner or manager comments concerning the postmining land use for all areas.*

Response and Analysis:

The response letter says that reference to the Manti-Lasal National Forest Approved Land Use Management Plan was included on page 1-13 and that page 6 of the cross-reference has been changed. The cross-reference now includes two references for the postmining land use comments. One is to a letter from the waste rock disposal area land owner. The other reference is V1-1.6. This is one of the sections of the plan that mentions the National Forest Land Use Management Plan. The other is on page 4-79 which contains comments from the plan. When comments from the land owner of the conveyor corridor are received, the cross-reference will need to be updated again.

Deficiencies:

Page 5
ACT/007/005
February 19, 1993

None.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The fish population information needs to be included in the plan as baseline information. This information may prove useful if there are disturbances to Eccles Creek or the water quality in this canyon.

Right of entry information and comments on the postmining land use need to be included in the plan. Skyline stated that they will be able to respond to these deficiencies by May 3, 1993. Because some negotiation with the land owner is occurring, an extension of time to complete these deficiencies should be allowed.