0049

Incoming
C/007/0005

From: <Jeff_McKenzie@blm.gov>
To: <pamgrubaughlittig@utah.gov>
Date: 7/31/2007 7:43 AM
Subject: Re: Fw: Permit IBC -- Skyline Mine

CC: <Steve_Rigby@blm.gov>, <Stan_Perkes@blm.gov>, <James_Kohler@ut.blm.gov>

We have reviewed the Skyline Permit IBC (PIBC) and here are our comments summarized by Steve Rigby:

Swinging the Mains to the East to make the longwall panels as long as possible enhances the economic viability of the lease. This should also make the graben crossing more perpendicular, maybe a little less rock work.

The moving of the permit boundary encourages the mining of other (non-BLM) coal in the area for overall energy resource recovery.

Need to question the legal description of the PIBC as given in the letter to Pam dated June 15, 2007. As written, the description is as follows:

RE: Incidental Boundary Change (PIBC) to include S1/2S1/2 Section 36 T 12 South, Range 6 East,
and the W1/2 of Section 1, the W1/2SW1/4 of Section 1, the N1/2NW1/4 of Section 12, and the
SW1/4NW1/4 of Section 12, Township 13 South, Range 6 East, SLB&M

In looking at the enclosed map:

Should be the W1/2SE1/4 of Section 1
Should also include the W1/2SW1/4 of Section 12 (This is shown on the map to be included in this IBC, but it looks like it should have already been included at some other time because there are mine workings in a portion of it.)

Note the rearrangement of the last two longwall panels in the current block. The panels have been shortened (due to the addition of the submains and the associated geometry).

In addition, we have some specific layout and timing questions which are usually addressed in an R2P2 submittal (not yet received). Once the R2P2 is received, discussed in some detail with the mine personnel, and revised as needed, we will provide a final summary. However the basic layout and concept appears to be a good approach and we do not anticipate significant changes will be needed..

THANKS,
Jeff