



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

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Kathleen Clarke
Executive Director

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

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)

August 4, 2000

Mike Glasson, Environmental Coordinator
West Ridge Resources, Inc.
P.O. Box 902
Price, Utah 84501

Re: Experimental Practice Evaluation, West Ridge Resources, West Ridge Mine, ACT/007/041, Outgoing File

Dear Mr. Glasson:

A special condition of the permit for the West Ridge Mine is that West Ridge Resources is required to evaluate the effectiveness of the experimental practice on an annual basis. The technical analysis associated with Division Order 00A says, "The permittee is required in the permit to conduct an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the experimental practice. This evaluation is due April 1, {2000}, but could be submitted with the required revised reclamation designs."

The Division has yet to receive your evaluation of the experimental practice. The as-built drawings and engineering report received in response to Division Order 00A do not specifically discuss the experimental practice although they relate to it since the reclamation grading plan is crucial to the experimental practice.

The Division is also required to conduct an annual evaluation. As part of the Division's evaluation, Bob Davidson, Pete Hess, and Paul Baker visited the mine on June 6, 2000. On July 11, 2000, Daron Haddock wrote to inform you of the results of the Division's evaluation. His letter discussed the potential for contamination of the soil resources by acid leachate and asked that you submit a plan to address this potential problem by August 11, 2000.

To avoid enforcement action, please submit an analysis of the effectiveness of the experimental practice and a plan for protecting soil resources from acid leachate by August 16, 2000. We consider the first year's analysis of the experimental practice to be particularly important. In your evaluation of the effectiveness of the experimental practice, we anticipate you will address the following issues:

1. How much was it necessary to change the channel configuration and remove rocks from the channel during construction? During reclamation, do you anticipate the channel will still be in basically the same condition as it was before construction as was planned, or will there be areas where it will be necessary to basically reconstruct the channel?
2. Was the soil surface left basically intact, or was it necessary to move rocks and do more

disturbance than we had planned?

3. In the plan, we anticipated there would be some soil compaction from the fill material, but how much was the soil compacted by vehicle traffic before starting to place the fill?
4. How well did the geotextile hold up as you were placing fill on it?
5. Were there changes to the plan that need to be shown in the plan so there is record of them for reclamation? It is vital to have such records at the time of reclamation.
6. Is there any other information that may become important for future reclamation or evaluation of the practice?

As a result of the analysis, you may find it necessary to change some portions of the mining and reclamation plan. If this is the case, you will probably need additional time to prepare an amendment, but the analysis needs to be submitted as soon as possible. Because the annual analyses will be important for the reclamation plan, we suggest you create an appendix in the mining and reclamation plan where they can be inserted.

If you need clarification of what needs to be in the analysis, please don't hesitate to call Paul Baker at (801)538-5261 or Robert Davidson at (801)538-5264.

Sincerely,


for Daron Haddock
Permit Supervisor