



0002

STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Oil, Gas & Mining

Scott M. Matheson, Governor  
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director  
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

November 20, 1984

Mr. William H. Geer, Acting Director  
Division of Wildlife Resources  
1596 West North Temple  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Dear Mr. Geer:

RE: Response to Technical Deficiencies Letter of October 19,  
1984, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Huntington #4 Mine,  
ACT/015/004, #2, Emery County, Utah

Enclosed please find one (1) copy of the above referenced Response to Technical Deficiencies contained in our letter dated October 19, 1984. This Response is forwarded for review by the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) in accordance with our Divisions' Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

As you may recall, the MOU between our Divisions' calls for the following:

B. Mine Plan Review

1. Upon submission of a mining and reclamation plan to DOGM, the DOGM will notify the DWR in writing of the need for consultation in evaluation of the plan with respect to fish and wildlife resources as required by MC 786.17(a)(2). DOGM will provide a copy of such plan to DWR when available.
2. The DWR will respond to DOGM in writing within 60 days of receipt of the plan with an evaluation of the adequacy or inadequacy of the fish and wildlife plan submitted by the operator to avoid, ameliorate or mitigate impacts of the proposed operation on wildlife resources.

Page 2

Mr. William H. Geer, Acting Director  
November 20, 1984

The Division appreciates your cooperation and asks that all comments and communications, regarding the mining and reclamation plan review, be channeled through this office to allow a single set of stipulations and requirements to be sent to the operator. If you have any questions, please contact me or Mary M. Boucek of my staff.

Sincerely,



Ronald W. Daniels  
Acting Administrator  
Mineral Resource Development  
and Reclamation Program

TM/btb  
Enclosure  
0046R



STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Oil, Gas & Mining

Scott M. Matheson, Governor  
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director  
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

November 20, 1984

Mr. Dee C. Hansen  
State Engineer  
Division of Water Rights  
1636 West North Temple  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Dear Mr. Hansen:

RE: Response to Technical Deficiencies Letter of October 19, 1984, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Huntington #4 Mine, ACT/015/004, #2, Emery County, Utah

Enclosed please find one (1) copy of the above referenced Response to Technical Deficiencies contained in our letter dated October 19, 1984. This Response is being forwarded for review by the Dam Safety and Water Rights sections of your office in accordance with our Divisions' Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

As you will recall, the MOU between our Divisions' calls for the following for the Dam Safety Section:

B. Mine Plan Review:

1. Upon submission of a mining and reclamation plan to DOGM, the DOGM will forward a copy of the mining and reclamation plan to Dam Safety. If information additional to that contained in the operator's submission is required, Dam Safety is responsible for contacting the operator to obtain such information. Copies of such requests and also copies of the company's submittal in response to the request will be submitted to DOGM.
2. Within 30 days of receipt of the mining and reclamation plan, Dam Safety shall contact DOGM with their final response to the agency's proposed action on the operator's application.

Page 2

Mr. Dee C. Hansen, State Engineer  
November 20, 1984

3. If Dam Safety proposes to reject the plan for failure to meet water retention safety standards, the DOGM will call a conference between the state and the operator at the earliest possible date.

The Division appreciates your cooperation and asks that all comments and communications, regarding the mining and reclamation plan review, be channeled through this office to allow a single set of stipulations and requirements to be sent to the operator. If you have any questions, please contact myself or Mary M. Boucek of my staff.

Sincerely,



Ronald W. Daniels  
Acting Administrator  
Mineral Resource Development  
and Reclamation Program

TM/btb  
Enclosure  
0046R



STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Oil, Gas & Mining

Scott M. Matheson, Governor  
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director  
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

November 20, 1984

Mr. Melvin T. Smith  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
Utah State Historical Society  
300 Rio Grande  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Dear Mr. Smith:

RE: Response to Technical Deficiencies Letter of October 19, 1984, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Huntington #4 Mine, ACT/015/004, #2, Emery County, Utah

Enclosed please find one (1) copy of the above referenced Response to Technical Deficiencies contained in our letter dated October 19, 1984. This Response is forwarded for review by the Division of State History in accordance with our Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

As you may recall, the MOU between our Divisions' calls for the following:

B. Mining Plan:

1. Upon submission of a coal mining and reclamation plan to the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining, the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining will notify the SHPO in writing of the need for consultation and evaluation of the plan with respect to historic and cultural resources. The Division of Oil, Gas & Mining will provide a copy of the relevant portion of the plan to the SHPO.
2. The SHPO will respond to the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining in writing within 30 days of receipt of the notification. The SHPO will include in such response an evaluation of the adequacy or inadequacy of the plan submitted by the operator to avoid, ameliorate or mitigate impacts of the proposed operation on historic and cultural resources.

Page 2

Mr. Melvin T. Smith  
November 20, 1984

3. Where the proposed mining plan, will, in the judgment of the SHPO, adversely effect sites listed on, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the SHPO shall proceed pursuant to 36 CFR 800. The SHPO will further assist the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining in its requirements set forth in MC 761.12(f) of the Coal Mining Regulations and make recommendations for survey and mitigation as appropriate.

The Division appreciates your cooperation and asks that all comments and communications, regarding the mining and reclamation plan review, be channeled through this office to allow a single set of stipulations and requirements to be sent to the operator. If you have any questions, please contact me or Mary M. Boucek of my staff.

Sincerely,



Ronald W. Daniels  
Acting Administrator  
Mineral Resource Development  
and Reclamation Program

TM/btb  
Enclosure  
0046R



STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Oil, Gas & Mining

Scott M. Matheson, Governor  
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director  
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

November 20, 1984

Mr. Kenneth Alkema  
Department of Health  
Division of Environmental Health  
P. O. Box 2500  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

Dear Mr. Alkema:

RE: Response to Technical Deficiencies Letter of October 19, 1984, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Huntington #4 Mine, ACT/015/004, #2, Emery County, Utah

Enclosed please find one (1) copy of the above referenced Response to Technical Deficiencies contained in our letter dated October 19, 1984. This Response is being forwarded for review by the Division of Environmental Health of your office.

As you will recall, the MOU between our Divisions' calls for the following:

B. Mine Plan Review.

1. Upon submission of a mining and reclamation plan to DOGM, the DOGM, shall, in consultation with DOH, review the operator's list of licenses, permits or approvals to determine whether or not approvals from DOH have been issued.
2. If any permits or approvals from the DOH have not been issued, the DOGM will submit to the DOH those parts of the permit application containing matters within the DOH's jurisdiction or interest for review and response and inform the operator in writing that he must contact DOH for the appropriate permits and approvals.
3. If additional information is required by DOH for any permit or approval, the DOH shall contact the operator for such information. Copies of any such requests and the operator's response to such request shall be forwarded by DOH to DOGM.

Page 2

Mr. Kenneth Alkema  
November 20, 1984

4. Within two weeks of receipt by DOGM of the mining operator's submission and any additional information requested, each DOH bureau shall contact the DOGM with preliminary written notification of the status of any outstanding permits or approvals. If DOH determines to reject the operator's permit application or has any major problems with the operator's mine plan, the DOGM may convene a conference between the state agencies and the operator as soon as possible.
5. The DOH will make every effort to have their response to the mine plan and any other DOH permits and approvals finally completed within 60 days of the DOH receipt for the operator's complete application for DOH permits and approvals.

The Division appreciates your cooperation and asks that all comments and communications, regarding the mining and reclamation plan review, be channeled through this office to allow a single set of stipulations and requirements to be sent to the operator. If you have any questions, please contact me or Mary M. Boucek of my staff.

Sincerely,



Ronald W. Daniels  
Acting Administrator  
Mineral Resource Development  
and Reclamation Program

TM/btb  
Enclosure  
0046R