

0025



STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Wildlife Resources

1596 West North Temple • Salt Lake City, UT 84116-3154 • 801-533-9333

7/2 cc: KEDASHY  
R Mutz  
Orig: minefile  
Norman H. Bangerter, Governor  
Dee C. Hansen, Executive Director  
William H. Geer, Division Director

ACT/007/007

September 25, 1986

RECEIVED  
SEP 30 1986

DIVISION OF  
OIL, GAS & MINING

Dr. Dianne R. Nielson, Director  
Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining  
355 West North Temple  
3 Triad Center, Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203

Attn: Kathy Mutz

Subject: Predevelopment consultation, Kaiser Coal Corp., No. 5 Mine (overland conveyor).

Dear Dianne:

This letter supplements our July 3, 1986, consultation and documents our comments presented in a consultation meeting with Kaiser and others (BLM, USFWS and DOGM) on August 18, 1986. As you know, Kaiser only recently identified their intent to construct a 5.3 mile long overland conveyor (60 inch belt) from A Canyon southward to their existing coal loadout facilities in Whitmore Canyon. The conveyor will be part of their No. 5 Mine Plan. This new proposal also identified a portal area in A Canyon and a 14-foot wide all-weather road that will parallel the conveyor and serve A Canyon.

The proposed conveyor route lies within critical and high priority valued mule deer winter range, as well as high priority valued Rocky Mountain elk winter range. Its alignment is perpendicular to the general migration direction of these animals as affected by changing snow depths on the winter range. Without question, the conveyor must be constructed so as to allow uninhibited migrational and daily movement by deer and elk.

Based upon Division research and experience with overland conveyors on winter range as they relate to big game movement, it is recommended that the structure be elevated adequately to allow underpassage by deer and elk. Specifically, 60% of the total length of the conveyor, as determined by random measurement, must provide at least 9.8 feet of unobstructed clearance. Areas that would provide less clearance can be specifically evaluated for placement of overpass structures, if deemed necessary. All parties involved in the consultation were provided with the most current technical publication concerning this issue.

The Division has serious concern for development of two major roads associated with the project. As you know, the original access road proposed for C Canyon was acceptable, providing that appropriate mitigation resulted.