0004


# State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
PO Box 145801
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-7223 (TDD)

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director


November 12, 1998

Dan Meadors, General Manager
Canyon Fuel Company, LLC
P.O. Box 719
Helper, Utah 84526

Re: Waste Rock Expansion Site, Canyon Fuel Company, LLC, Skyline Mine, ACT/007/005-98F, File #2, Carbon County, Utah

Dear Mr. Meadors:

The referenced amendment has been reviewed by Senior Reclamation Specialists Mike Suflita, Wayne Western, Paul Baker and Steve Demczak. Their analyses and findings are provided for your review and response by November 30, 1998.

**TECHNICAL ANALYSIS:**

## HYDROLOGIC RESOURCE INFORMATION

Regulatory Reference R645-301-121.200

**Analysis:**

There are a number of inconsistencies in the submittal that need correction. These include:

- The map contained on Dwg. 3.2.8-2, Waste Rock Facilities and Drainage Control, appears to be inaccurate. This is due to the Permit Area Boundary symbol simply disappearing on the west side of the map. Further, that boundary as shown, results in the Expansion Area being OUTSIDE the permit area. Further, the existing road leading to the Waste Rock Facility is also shown OUTSIDE the permit area. The map needs to be redrawn to correctly and completely show the permit area boundary.

- The discussion on page 4-38(a) regarding reclamation at the waste rock disposal site is not specific as to how and when the area along the access road will be revegetated. This is designated as ASCA 24 on Dwg. 3.2.8-2, Waste Rock Facilities and Drainage Control. Phone conversations with the Applicant indicate they plan to do final reclamation this area immediately after the road is constructed. This needs to be clearly explained in the amendment, including following the revegetation commitments in the rest of the MRP. Also, the text designates the area as ASCA 24(a) while the drawing designates it as ASCA 24. The two need to be consistent.

- The calculations for the Inlet to Pond from DD-17, page 24, show the ditch depth to be feet and a total width that is 0.13 foot shorter than the water width. These need to be corrected.

- Page 3-18(a) indicates that the design storm volume is 53,578 cu. ft. and the sediment s is 33,454 cu. ft. with a combined volume of 87,120 cu. ft. When those first two numb added, they equal 87,032. This inconsistency needs to be resolved.

- The lower end of UD-6 is not shown as flowing into the stream on Dwg. 3.2.8-2, Was Facilities and Drainage Control. This needs to be added.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is not considered adequate to meet the requirements of this section of the regulations. Prior to approval, the Applicant must provide th following in accordance with the requirements of:

**R645-301-121.200**, a revised Dwg. 3.2.8-2, Waste Rock Facilities and Drainage Contr revised page 4-38(a) with complete reclamation plans, a revised drawing of Inle Pond from DD-17, a consistent total sediment pond volume on page 3-18(a).

Regulatory Reference R645-301-742.300

**Analysis:**

Diversion ditches UD-5 and UD-6 are both concrete lined as are the ditches in place to before the changes to the waste rock pile. They have been performing well and the new ones s so in the future. UD-5 is a significantly less slope than the channel that feeds into it and this wil present a ongoing maintenance issue with deposited sediment.

The other ditches appear to be properly designed with a new DD-16 that flows into the and stabilized reach that is rock armored. The two swales in the road appear adequate.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is considered adequate to meet the require this section of the regulations.

Regulatory Reference R645-301-746.320

**Analysis:**

The riprap at the sediment pond spillway outlet is not adequate. During a site visit ther almost no riprap at all. The current plans do not show the top of the pond embankment as havi riprap and this is needed to prevent erosion.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is not considered adequate to meet the requirements of this section of the regulations. Prior to approval, the Applicant must provide th following in accordance with the requirements of:

**R645-301-746.320**, provisions to riprap the sediment pond spillway outlet.

Regulatory Reference R645-301-742.221.34

**Analysis:**

There is no provision to gain access to the valve at the inlet end of the decant pipe for t sediment pond. The inlet is under water out in the pond. That has resulted in the pond not bei decanted after a storm event. During a site visit the Applicant committed to pumping the pond restore it's capacity to contain design events. While vandalism can be a problem at the site, ch locks can be employed. Regardless of how it is achieved, the pond must be decanted after stor events.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is not considered adequate to meet the requirements of this section of the regulations. Prior to approval, the Applicant must provide th following in accordance with the requirements of:

**R645-301-742.221.34,** provide a means for effectively decanting the pond with the pip configuration shown, namely a valve control mechanism that can be operated fr pond bank.

Regulatory Reference R645-301-742.240

**Analysis:**

The plan shows ASCA 24 below the lower end of the access road. This area is to be revegitated and will have sediment fences at the lower end. These lead to a sediment trap at th

point. This appears to be an adequate means to deal with the situation.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is considered adequate to meet the require this section of the regulations.

Regulatory Reference R645-301-234.200

**Analysis:**

A site visit showed a topsoil storage pile on top of the waste rock pile. The area where topsoil pile is located is to be covered by waste rock. The disposition of the topsoil pile has not addressed in the proposed amendment. It is recommended that the Applicant consult with the Soil Scientist to determine acceptable methods of dealing with this situation.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is not considered adequate to meet the requirements of this section of the regulations. Prior to approval, the Applicant must provide th following in accordance with the requirements of:

**R645-301-234.200**, provide a complete description of the disposition of the topsoil pile of the waste rock pile in order to obtain the necessary Division approval.

Regulatory Reference R645-301-742.223

**Analysis:**

The sediment pond and it's associated spillway have been designed to meet or exceed th regulation design events.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is considered adequate to meet the require this section of the regulations.

Regulatory Reference R645-301-521.150

**Analysis:**

The amendment contains no information on the final reclamation configuration of the w

rock site. Apparently the Applicant expects to leave the enlarged pile as part of the postmining use. Further, the property is leased and the landowner intends for the pile to become part of a livestock operation. Regulations call for Land Surface Configuration maps for the reclaimed ar these have not been provided. Page 4.1-3 indicates "The final contours of the rack disposal site presented in Drawing 4.16.1-1B." This drawing needs to be revised and submitted as part of t amendment.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is not considered adequate to meet the requirements of this section of the regulations. Prior to approval, the Applicant must provide th following in accordance with the requirements of:

**R645-301-521.150**, a revised reclamation contour map.

Regulatory Reference R645-301-731

**Analysis:**

The Applicant discussed the intent to reclaim the site and leave the sediment pond at the end of the site. In addition, there is a possibility that a second pond will be constructed at the u end of the site at reclamation time. This is the desire of the landowner and is consistent with th postmining land use of grazing. However, the plan does not address the issue of water rights associated with these ponds. Since the water will not flow into the stream as it did before recla and since stock watering is a beneficial use of the water, there needs to be an associated water r Obtaining the rights is not necessary to approval of this requested action, however, it will be ne before final reclamation. If the rights cannot be obtained, the leaving of the ponds will not be p

**Findings:**

The information provided in the application is not considered adequate to meet the requirements of this section of the regulations. Prior to approval, the Applicant must provide th following in accordance with the requirements of:

**R645-301-731**, evidence of water rights consistent with the postmining land use.

## RECOMMENDATION

The proposed amendment should not be approved in the present form. Except for the rights mentioned in the last item above, the Applicant must provide the information outlined ab before approval is granted.

**Analysis:**

**Determination of bond amount.**

In amendment AM98F, the Permittee proposes to expand the waste rock site at the Skyl Mine. The Permittee did not include any reclamation cost information with the amendment. U R645-301-830.140 the Permittee must give the Division detailed reclamation cost information f coal mining activities. The Division needs the information in order to adjust the bond (see R6 830.140).

The Permittee informally told the Division that no additional bond would be required, b of the contemporaneous reclamation being done at the waste rock site. The Permittee claims th every acre he disturbs one acre is reclaimed.

The only way the Division can reduce the bond amount for work already done is throug bond release process. Since the Permittee has not applied for bond release at the waste rock sit Division cannot reduce the bond amount.

**Findings:**

The information provided in the proposed amendment is not considered adequate to me requirements of this section. Prior to approval, the Permittee must provide the following in acc with:

**R645-301-830,** the Permittee must provide the Division with detailed reclamation cost e for the expansion at the Skyline Mine waste rock site.

**TECHNICAL ANALYSIS:**

## HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE INFORMATION

Regulatory Reference: R645-301-411

**Analysis:**

Appendix A-3 of the existing mining and reclamation plan contains a cultural resources s report for the waste rock disposal area. This survey was conducted in 1981. The only site that w disturbed by mining was the UP Canyon strip mine, and it was not considered eligible for listing National Register of Historic Places. No sites were found in the proposed expansion area.

**Findings:**

Information provided in the application is considered adequate to meet the requirements section of the regulations.

## REVEGETATION

Regulatory Reference: R645-301-341

**Analysis:**

The existing mining and reclamation plan discusses revegetation of the waste rock dispo This plan is considered adequate. All but one species in the seed mix were found growing on rev portions of the site in a 1998 field visit, and no signs of serious erosion were found.

The plan says the applicant will use the best mulching technology available at the time o reclamation, and the applicant has been using erosion control matting. While this appears to be properly, the netting has not been deteriorating. In the future, the applicant should use matting w netting that will degrade over time. Existing netting needs to be removed from the site.

**Findings:**

Information provided in the application is considered adequate to meet the requirements section of the regulations. Netting from the erosion control matting has not been deteriorating, a needs to be removed. In the future, the applicant should use netting that will degrade more quick

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Biology and land use sections of the application are considered adequate and can be appr The Division recommends the applicant use netting that will degrade more quickly than what has used in the past.

**TECHNICAL ANALYSIS:**

**OPERATION PLAN**

**MAPS, PLANS, CROSS SECTION**

Regulatory Reference: R645-301-512.120, R-645-521.165

**Analysis:**

**Mining Facilities Maps**

The permittee has submitted an updated surface facilities map to show the location to the pile, including the expanded area. These maps are P.E. certified as required by the Coal Rules.

**Findings:**

Surface facilities map has been submitted and is considered adequate to meet this section

R645-Coal Rules.

**MAP, PLANS, CROSS-SECTIONS OF THE MINING OPERATIONS**

Regulatory reference: R645-301-512.140

**Analysis:**

**Drainage Maps**

The permittee has included an updated drainage map which is certified by a professional engineer. The map meets all the requirements of the Engineering section.

**Findings:**

The requirements of this section of the regulations are considered adequate in regard to t proposed permit change for the expansion to the waste rock site.

**TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES**

Regulatory reference: R645-301-527, R645-301512.250

**Analysis:**

**Roads**

The permittee has extended it's primary road to the refuse pile and it is identified on the There are road designs and cross-sections as required by the coal rules. The permittee did not ge cross-section drawing 3.2.8-B certified by a professional engineer.

**Findings:**

Information provided in the proposed amendment is not considered adequate to meet the requirements of this section.

**R645-301-512.250,** All primary roads must be certified by a professional engineer. The must also certify the designs and construction or reconstruction of primary roads to meet the requirements of R645-301-534.200 and R645-301-742.420.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Prior to approval, the permittee must address R645-301-512.250 as stated in the outline a

It is also recommended that the permittee re-estimate the yearly tons and cubic yards wa to the site. The 2,500 tons is extremely conservative compared to the past few years of develop waste that has been produced. This statement is on page 4-90.

If you have any questions please call.

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Helfrich
Permit Supervisor

tam
cc: Price Field Office
O:\007005.SKY\FINAL\DEF.98F