0018

STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

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

355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

July 1, 1985

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
(P402 457 192)

Mr. Dan W. Guy, Manager
Permitting and Compliance
Beaver Creek Coal Company
P. O. Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501

Dear Mr. Guy:

RE: Determination of Completeness/Technical Deficiencies Review, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Gordon Creek #3 and #6 Mines, INA/007/017, #2, Carbon County, Utah

The Division has reviewed the latest submittal for the Gordon Creek #3 and #6 Mine plan. Two deficiencies still remain which prevent the plan from being determined complete and public notice being given pursuant to UMC 786.11. In addition, numerous technical deficiencies have been identified which must be addressed before a Technical Analysis can be prepared by the Division.

It is most imperative that Beaver Creek Coal Company (BCCC) respond immediately to the two Determination of Completeness (DOC) deficiencies in order that the plan may be determined complete. It is, therefore, requested that you respond to the two DOC deficiencies identified by July 3, 1985. Adequate response to these deficiencies will hopefully allow the Division to determine the plan complete and BCCC can then publish notice for four consecutive weeks as required in UMC 786.11. The Division must wait an additional 30 days beyond the last newspaper publication date in order for public comments to be submitted.

In order to attempt to permit this operation and allow reclamation activities to occur this year, the Technical Deficiencies identified must be addressed by July 31, 1985. This should allow the Division to prepare a TA and be in a position to issue a permit shortly after the public comment period following publication has ended.

Thank you for your prompt attention to these matters, if you should have any questions or need clarification, please feel free to contact me or John Whitehead with my staff.

Sincerely,

Lowell P. Braxton

Lowell P. Braxton
Administrator
Mineral Resource Development
and Reclamation Program

JW/btb
Enclosures
cc: Allen Klein
Steve Cox
Pam Grubaugh-Littig
Ev Hooper
Tom Munson
Rick Smith
John Whitehead
9294R-36 & 37

DETERMINATION OF COMPLETENESS DEFICIENCIES

Beaver Creek Coal Company
Gordon Creek #3 and #6 Mines
INA/007/017, Carbon County, Utah

July 1, 1985

Item #1

UMC 783.19 Vegetation Information - SC

No reference area has been established for the riparian area and acceptable standards for success for this area have not been proposed. Additionally, as requested in our August 28, 1984 Determination of Completeness (DOC) letter, a statement of productivity for each reference area must be obtained from the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). If the reference areas are not in fair condition or better, management practices must be delineated to ensure that reference areas are in fair or better condition when comparisons are to be made with the reclaimed area.

UMC 784.23 Operation Plan: Maps and Plans

As noted in our August 28, 1984 DOC letter, please provide a map which delineates each area for which a performance bond will be posted.

TECHNICAL DEFICIENCIES

UMC 805.11 - PGL

Production rates and hourly rates for equipment must be included in the MRP. Additionally, cost references should also be included. The 10 percent contingency must be added to the subtotal of the bond. Monitoring costs must be detailed and include costs for subsidence, erosion and hydrologic and revegetation monitoring. Costs must also be escalated for the five year permit term.

UMC 817.13-.15 - RS

The recommended concrete seals for the portals were not installed at the #3 and #6 mine portals. The applicant must provide written documentation from MSHA that recommended concrete seals should not be installed a minimum of 25 feet inby the portal openings.

UMC 817.22 - EH

The MRP provides two samples in the 7.6 acres of disturbance to characterize the soil substitute material to be used for reclamation. This is not an adequate size sampling to determine the quality and quantity of suitable soil material. A plan must be submitted which identifies additional sample locations for each pad area and downslope area that will have soil used as a topsoil substitute. Additional samples must be taken to a minimum depth of 18 inches and the results submitted to the Division. These additional soil samples are necessary to insure enough suitable soil is available for reclamation.

UMC 817.43

The applicant use of the Farmer-Fletcher distribution for generation of peak flows is not acceptable to the Division. The SCS type II storm distribution is acceptable to the Division for prediction of peak flows. Revised peak flows must be submitted using an acceptable 24 hour duration rainfall distribution.

It is not clear how the 7.96 acres of reclaimed land will drain to the reclaimed diversion. This must be clarified and recalculations for the diversion must reflect that this acreage has been included.

UMC 817.45

The proposal for installation of silt fences and the justification for the use of 150 n fabric filter must be clarified. An exact installation configuration must be shown in the MRP for silt fences. Justification must be given for selection of the particular fabric filter identified in the MRP.

UMC 817.42 and UMC 817.52

The applicant should commit to monitor sites 3-1-W and 3-4-W for the parameters and frequencies delineated on the attached list of parameters. The applicant must also commit to remove monitoring devices at the cessation of monitoring.

UMC 817.47

The peak flow methodology used to size the pond discharge device is not acceptable to the Division. Once again, the SCS Type II storm distribution is acceptable, or the applicant may explore alternative methodologies. Use of the Farmer-Fletcher rainfall distribution for a 24-hour storm duration is not acceptable.

Additionally, the MRP must show that the 7.96 acres of reclaimed area has been included in the peak flow calculations for sizing the spillways and discharge structure protection.

UMC 817.50

Based on the potential for discharge from the workings at this site, a commitment must be included in the MRP that sampling on a quarterly basis until bond release will occur for any discharges of underground workings which occur after mining. Sampling will assess if the discharges are in compliance with the effluent standards of UMC 817.42 and any other applicable State and federal regulations. The MRP must commit to provide treatment to these discharges if necessary to achieve compliance with applicable standards during the period of discharge.

UMC 817.54 - TM

The MRP notes on page 3-19A that an alternative water supply has been proposed to replace water affected by mining operations. However, the alternative water supply is not identified. The MRP must specifically state what alternative water supplies are proposed for replacement water.

UMC 817.56 - JW

The MRP does not commit to renovating the permanent ponds proposed to the criteria specified in the original detailed mine plan upon the termination of bonding. This must be committed to in the MRP.

The liability for the pond structures must also be officially assumed by the landowner before the ponds can remain. Documentation in the MRP that the landowner will assume liability for these structures must be included.

UMC 817.59 - RS

Mining in the Hiawatha Seam has excluded the recovery of approximately 90 acres in the overlying Castlegate "A" Seam. The MRP must include justification for excluding the recovery of the approximately 90 acres in the Castlegate "A" Seam which has been undermined.

UMC 817.89 - PGL

The MRP has not explicitly delineated where disposal of noncoal waste will take place. The MRP must clearly address how noncoal waste will be handled during reclamation.

UMC 817.101 - EH

The MRP proposed to backfill highwalls to the extent possible, but does not give any volume estimates of material needed to accomplish this. The MRP must contain volume estimates of the backfill material and the exact sources of this material.

UMC 817.103 - EH

The MRP fails to identify the volume of coal and soil contaminated with over five percent coal files. The MRP must contain a specific volume estimate of coal fines and coal fine contaminated soil along with the location and techniques for disposal onsite of these material.

UMC 817.111 - SC

Sections 9.4 through 9.9 of the Mining and Reclamation Plan (MRP) are missing. The applicant must submit these.

The applicant has conflicting numbers in the MRP in regards to the exact acreage of surface disturbance. Page 3-8 notes 7.96 acres, pages 9-2, 9-3 and 10-38 list 34.4 acres. This must be clarified.

UMC 817.112 - SC

The applicant should replace *Trifolium pratense* with *Hedysarum boreale* and *Rubus idaeus* with *Purshia tridentata* in the final seed mixture. These replacement species are more suited to the climate of the area and are commercially available.

The applicant must clarify when shrub and tree planting will be undertaken on the disturbed areas. Spring planting is usually the most favorable. However, fall planting can be successful if plans have adequate soil moisture and time to become established before freezing occurs.

UMC 817.117 - SC

Standards for success for woody plant densities on the reclaimed area have not been given. The applicant must propose these and indicate how the standards will be compared between reference and reclaimed areas.

UMC 817.124 - RS

Information has not been provided in the MRP to document whether surface subsidence and associated tension cracks have occurred above the workings. An assessment of whether subsidence has caused material damage or reduced the value or reasonably foreseeable use of the surface lands cannot be made. Therefore, the MRP must contain the results of a field investigation for the purpose of identifying and recording surface manifestations of subsidence above the workings, and must provide a subsidence monitoring plan that incorporates permanent subsidence monitoring stations above the workings. The plan for monitoring shall include a commitment for annual monitoring and submittal of derived subsidence data to the Division until bond release.

UMC 817.133 - TM

The applicant has proposed the plugging and retention of the 48-inch bypass culvert following reclamation. The Division needs information to document the long-term stability of the culvert. This documentation should address what will happen when eventually the culvert collapses and the subsequent surface impacts from that occur.

UMC 817.150-.156 - PGL

The MRP states that the haul road was built and maintained as a Class I haul road. However, specifications for road width, road gradient, road surface, road drainage and road maintenance are not given in the MRP. The MRP must include a map with appropriate cross sections, specifications, road width, gradient, road surface, drainage and planned road maintenance throughout the bond liability period.

UMC 817.160-.166 - PGL

The MRP does not contain a map of appropriate cross-sections, road gradients, road widths, road surface and fill embankment information for the Class II road on the permit area. Additionally, a maintenance plan for the road throughout the bond liability period must be included in the MRP.

The mine operations map, Plate 3-2, as referred to in the MRP as a transportation map has not been certified by a registered professional engineer as required.

UMC 817.180 - PGL

The MRP does not definitively indicate which structures have been removed. This must be clear in the MRP. The MRP must also state how the area was restored to prevent damage to fish, wildlife and related environmental values as well as prevention of additional contributions of suspended solids to streamflow and runoff outside the permit area.

0351R