

0007

STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES & ENERGY
Wildlife Resources

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

File ACT/007/012
Folder No. 2
Copy to Skannan,
Scott M. Matheson, Governor
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director
Douglas F. Day, Division Director
Tom P. Lynn

September 23, 1983

RECEIVED
SEP 28 1983

Mr. Jim Shirazi, Director
Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
4241 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

DIVISION OF
OIL, GAS & MINING

Subject: U.S. Steel Corporation's Response to ACR for MRP at
Wellington Coal Processing Plan

JIM
SEP 28 1983

Dear Jim:

The Division has evaluated U.S. Steel Corporation's response to the apparent completeness review for the Mining and Reclamation Plan at the Wellington Coal Processing Plant.

Enclosed are the Division's specific comments and recommendations. Generally speaking, the company has only partly identified the wildlife resource associated with their project. A project specific species list has been provided to the company and should become part of the MRP. A need for a detailed and specific mitigation plan still exists.

Thank you for an opportunity to review the MRP and provide comment.

Sincerely,



Douglas F. Day
Director

Mr. Jim Shirazi
September 23, 1983
Page 2

UTAH DIVISION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES' COMMENTS RELATIVE TO
U.S. STEEL CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO THE APPARENT COMPLETE-
NESS REVIEW FOR THE MINING AND RECLAMATION PLAN (MRP) AT
THE WELLINGTON COAL PREPARATION PLANT

Page 783-39 & 40, (a)(2)(ii) - The Division has reviewed the SCS rating system for wildlife habitat. Essentially, it reflects the relative lushness of the site in terms of the capabilities of the soil type. Many wildlife thrive under lush conditions, but many others would not survive under such lush conditions. The Division's ranking system for habitats and use areas takes into account the site's relative biological value to the myriad of wildlife having potential to inhabit the area. Thus, our comments provided to your office August 18, 1981, referencing page 783-27, (a)(2)(ii) of the original MRP, remain unchanged.

Page 784-29 & 30 - The MRP fails to identify a specific and detailed reclamation plan for the disturbed areas. The slurry ponds have inundated a perennial stream; critical valued riparian habitat was lost. This habitat should be reestablished through implementation of a reclamation plan.

Page 784-39 & 40 - The fish and wildlife mitigation plan does not address mitigation for the wildlife habitats lost during the interim of operations. It seems reasonable that mitigation could be represented by wildlife vegetation plantings to be protected from grazing in the agricultural areas on the permit area.

Additionally, the mitigation plan is not specific or a commitment by the company. The MRP just says the plan "will be considered".