ACT/015/007
#5

0019

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

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Ted Stewart
Executive Director
James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

May 24, 1994

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
P 074 977 127

Thomas E. Ehmett, Acting Director
Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement
505 Marquette N.W., Suite 1200
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Re: Ten-Day Notice #X94-020-190-001 TV1

Dear Mr. Ehmett:

With regard to the referenced Ten-Day Notice which addresses the permittee's failure to control or prevent erosion on the reclaimed access road by vegetating or otherwise stabilizing all exposed surfaces in accordance with prudent engineering practices, I offer the following response:

By reference in your May 9, 1994 mine site evaluation inspection report, you are aware that previous enforcement action by the Division (Notice of Violation N91-26-8-2, No. 1 of 2) had been vacated in a ruling published December 1, 1993, from the Utah Court of Appeals. A copy for your reference is attached. The referenced Notice of Violation was issued November 22, 1991, by William J. Malencik, Reclamation Specialist for the Division. Although the violation was vacated, the permittee did submit an abatement plan that was approved by the Division dated December 8, 1992. As a result of the joint state/federal oversight inspection of May 4, 1994, and subsequent issuance of the referenced federal Ten-Day Notice, the permittee in a letter dated May 12, 1994 (attached) has proposed to implement the approved abatement plan for the dismissed Notice of Violation referenced above.

On May 20, 1994, Reclamation Specialists, William J. Malencik and Pete Hess, conducted a partial inspection of the Hidden Valley site. Division staff were able to determine that seven gullies, five of which were the subject of the

referenced Ten-Day Notice had been hand shaped in preparation for additional armoring by the permittee. Karla Knoop, consultant for the permittee, conveyed in a conversation to Messieurs Malencik and Hess that hand work had commenced during the week of May 16, 1994, with an anticipated completion date within the next 30 days.

Sincerely,

Lowell P. Braxton
Associate Director, Mining

jbe
Attachments (2)
cc: J. Carter
W. Malencik
H:HIDDENVA.X94

FILED
Utah Court of Appeals

DEC 01 1993

Mary T. Noonan
Clerk of the Court

This opinion is subject to revision before publication in the Pacific Reporter.

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

----ooOoo----

Hidden Valley Coal Company,	)	OPINION
	)	(For Publication)
Plaintiff and Appellant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 930073-CA
	)	
Utah Board of Oil, Gas & Mining and the Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining,	)	F I L E D
	)	(December 1, 1993)
Defendants and Appellees.	)	

Third District, Salt Lake County
The Honorable Glenn K. Iwasaki

Attorneys: Denise A. Dragoo, Peter Stirba, Benson L. Hathaway, Jr., and Margaret H. Olson, Salt Lake City, for Appellant
Jan Graham, William R. Richards, and Thomas A. Mitchell, Salt Lake City, for Appellees

---

Before Judges Bench, Jackson, and Orme.

BENCH, Judge:

Hidden Valley Coal Company (Hidden Valley) appeals from the decision of the district court upholding in part the decision of the Utah Board of Oil, Gas & Mining (Board), holding Hidden Valley in violation of certain reclamation standards and imposing civil penalties. We reverse.

FACTS

In 1978, Hidden Valley's affiliate, Soldier Creek Coal Company (Soldier Creek), purchased a mine site located in Emery County, Utah. In late 1978, Soldier Creek approached the Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining (Division) to obtain a permit to mine coal from the mine site. In September 1979, Soldier Creek submitted a mining and reclamation plan detailing its proposal for development and operation of the mine site. In April 1980,

the Division approved the mining and reclamation plan, and shortly thereafter, Soldier Creek began mining operations.

Over the next few months, Soldier Creek cut two large pad areas, exposed a coal seam, established drainage ditches, constructed culverts that altered natural runoff and stream flows, installed sediment ponds, and constructed more than three miles of access roads. However, by August 1980, Soldier Creek determined that commercial development of the mine site was not economically feasible and ceased development.

In October 1985, Hidden Valley notified the Division that it had sold its Soldier Creek affiliate and had assumed control of the mine site. Shortly after assuming control, Hidden Valley notified the Division that it planned to reclaim the mine site. In May 1986, Hidden Valley submitted a reclamation plan for Division review. Hidden Valley's reclamation plan required that the mine site be regraded, scarified, and reseeded. In December 1986, the Division approved Hidden Valley's reclamation plan.

After the Division approved the reclamation plan, Hidden Valley began reclamation activities. Between the commencement of reclamation activities and late 1991, the Division inspected the mine site at least fifty-nine times. The Division noted after each inspection that Hidden Valley was in full compliance with all its reclamation permits and standards. In June 1988, the Division approved a Phase I bond release for the mine site, indicating that as a result of its latest inspection "the backfilling, grading, topsoil placement and drainage controls were determined complete."[1]

On November 1, 1991, Division inspector Jess W. Kelley conducted a five and one-half hour inspection of the mine site. Mr. Kelley found Hidden Valley to be in compliance with all permits and performance standards. Mr. Kelley noted that the diversions and revegetation efforts, as well as the placement of markers and signs, were in full compliance. Specifically, Mr. Kelley stated that "[t]he large rip-rap diversions between the 'A' and 'B' seam fill areas is [sic] in good condition and free from obstruction" and "[o]ther Sediment Control Measures--Silt fences at the base of the 'A' seam fill and parallel to the large main diversion are in good repair and have not captured runoff since they were last maintained." Mr. Kelley also found Hidden

---

1. Hidden Valley was required to provide a bond for the reclamation work at the mine site. The reclamation was divided into separate phases. At the completion of each phase, Hidden Valley, if it complied with the permit and other reclamation requirements, was allowed to reduce the bond amount.

Valley's drainage controls on the roads to be in good condition and in compliance with all permits and performance standards. Mr. Kelley also noted, "[w]ater bars and diversions on the main reclaimed road are functioning well and are in good condition."[2]

On November 19, eighteen days after the previous inspection, inspector Bill Malencik conducted an inspection of the mine site. Mr. Malencik found Hidden Valley to be in violation of several permit and performance standards. Shortly thereafter, the Division issued a Notice of Violation (NOV) stating that Hidden Valley had failed to: (1) "maintain diversions to be stable" and "minimize erosion to the extent possible" on the road outslope and upslope; and (2) "clearly mark with perimeter markers all disturbed areas" and "seed and revegetate all disturbed areas" on the road and stream outslopes and the road upslopes. Hidden Valley was required to abate all violations found in the NOV. In December, the Division issued a proposed penalty assessment for the NOV totaling $1,220.

After the Division issued the NOV, Hidden Valley petitioned the Division for an informal hearing. On December 20, the Division director held an informal hearing to review Hidden Valley's contentions. In January 1992, the director issued an order upholding the NOV in its entirety. Hidden Valley appealed the decision of the director to the Board.

The chairman of the Board, acting as a hearing examiner, conducted a formal evidentiary hearing on Hidden Valley's contentions. The Board, after considering the chairman's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, issued an order upholding the Division's issuance of the NOV. The Board did, however, reduce the total amount of the penalty assessment to $1,090.

Hidden Valley filed an appeal in district court seeking judicial review of the Board's order pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 40-10-30 (1993). The district court heard oral argument and later entered an order upholding in part the Board's decision. The court upheld the Board's decision with respect to the

---

2. Mr. Kelley also conducted a partial inspection on October 8, 1991, finding Hidden Valley to be in compliance with all permits and performance standards. Mr. Kelley stated that the "haul road diversion, including water bars, was in good condition and contained a good cover of vegetation," and "[u]p to this time, vegetation has been very sparse because of the lack of moisture. Now, happily, due to recent rains, reseeded areas on both 'A' and 'B' seam fills are sustaining a fairly thick growth of vegetation."

allegations that Hidden Valley had failed to maintain stable diversions, minimize erosion to the extent possible, and seed and revegetate disturbed areas. However, the court overturned the Board's decision with respect to the allegation that Hidden Valley had failed to place perimeter markers on all disturbed areas.[3] Hidden Valley now appeals the Board's order to this court pursuant to section 40-10-30.

ISSUE

Hidden Valley argues that the Board erroneously interpreted and applied the Utah Coal Mining and Reclamation Act (UCMRA), Utah Code Ann. § 40-10-1 to -31 (1993), in concluding that the Division established a prima facie case supported by substantial evidence for its issuance of the NOV and that Hidden Valley failed to rebut the Division's case.[4]

---

3. While we are required to review the actions of the Board and not the district court, see Cowling v. Board of Oil, Gas & Mining, 830 P.2d 220, 223 (Utah 1991), the issue of placement of perimeter markers was reversed by the district court and was not appealed to this court by the Division. Therefore, Hidden Valley's alleged failure to properly place perimeter markers is not before this court on appeal.

4. Hidden Valley raises two additional issues on appeal: (1) whether the Board erroneously interpreted and applied UCMRA and Utah law in concluding that the Division was not estopped from enforcing its NOV after it had repeatedly found the mine site to be in compliance with the reclamation plan and applicable law; and (2) whether the Board erred in concluding that the statute of limitations did not bar issuance of the NOV. Because of our holding on Hidden Valley's prima facie case argument, we need not reach Hidden Valley's additional issues.

The Division argues that this appeal is moot because Hidden Valley complied with the NOV by submitting an abatement plan. However, the underlying purpose of the NOV was physical abatement of the alleged violations found in the NOV, not merely the filing of an abatement plan. Hidden Valley has not undertaken any physical abatement under the NOV. This appeal is therefore not moot and the Division's argument to the contrary is without merit.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Our review of the Division's actions under UCMRA is not governed by the Utah Administrative Procedures Act (UAPA). Utah Code Ann. § 40-10-31 (1993). The provisions of UCMRA relating to agency adjudicative proceedings before the Division or Board supersede the procedures and requirements of UAPA. Id. Therefore, the standard of review for this appeal is governed by Utah Code Ann. § 40-10-30 (1993) and pre-UAPA case law.

Section 40-10-30 provides, in pertinent part:

> (1) An appeal from a rule or order of the board shall be a trial on the record and is not a trial de novo. The court shall set aside the board action if it is found to be:
>
> (a) unreasonable, unjust, arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion;
>
> (b) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;
>
> (c) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations;
>
> (d) not in compliance with procedure required by law;
>
> (e) based upon a clearly erroneous interpretation or application of the law; or
>
> (f) as to an adjudicative proceeding, unsupported by substantial evidence on the record.

For cases decided outside the confines of UAPA, "[w]hen a lower court reviews an order of an administrative agency and we exercise appellate review of the lower court's judgment, we act as if we were reviewing the administrative agency decision directly." Cowling v. Board of Oil, Gas & Mining, 830 P.2d 220, 223 (Utah 1991) (citing Bennion v. Utah State Board of Oil, Gas & Mining, 675 P.2d 1135, 1139 (Utah 1983)).

Prior to the adoption of UAPA, agencies' findings of fact were "granted considerable deference and would not be disturbed on appeal if supported by substantial evidence." Morton Int'l, Inc. v. State Tax Comm'n, 814 P.2d 581, 585 (Utah 1991). Substantial evidence has been defined to be "such relevant evidence as reasonable minds might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Johnson v. Board of Review, 842 P.2d 910, 911 (Utah App. 1992) (quoting Grace Drilling Co. v. Board of Review, 776 P.2d 63, 68 (Utah App. 1989)).

ANALYSIS

Hidden Valley argues that the Division has not established a prima facie showing of the facts supporting its NOV. The Division has the burden of establishing a prima facie case as to the fact of a violation under UCMRA.[5]

The evidence is uncontroverted that up until November 1, 1991, Hidden Valley was in full compliance with the reclamation plan. Because the Division certified that Hidden Valley was in full compliance on November 1, the Division was required to establish that some intervening event or condition occurred between the November 1 and November 19 inspections in order to establish a prima facie showing that Hidden Valley was not in full compliance. The Division could also try to establish that its prior inspections were somehow deficient such that non-compliance actually occurred prior to November 1, 1991.

Failure to Maintain Stable Diversions

The Board found that Hidden Valley "failed to comply with the Permanent Program standards and the approved Reclamation Plan by failing to adequately construct and maintain erosion control structures on the outslopes of the access haul road." Based on this finding, the Board upheld the portion of the Division's NOV that cited Hidden Valley for failing to maintain stable diversions. At the formal hearing before the Board, the Division presented no evidence to indicate that in the eighteen days prior to the inspection giving rise to the NOV, there had been any change in conditions or circumstances with regard to the stability of the diversions on the road outslopes. Neither did the Division present any evidence that it had previously notified Hidden Valley that it was close to a violation with respect to the diversions. While inspector Malencik did testify that during the inspection he conducted in April 1991 he considered several areas of the mine site, apparently including the diversions, to be close calls, he also testified that he only indicated that they should be watched because they had the potential to become problems. His report from that inspection indicated that Hidden Valley was in full compliance. Consequently, the Division has

---

5. UCMRA is virtually identical to its federal counterpart, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA). See 30 U.S.C. §§ 1201 to 1328 (1977). Under SMCRA, the Office of the Secretary of the Interior carries the burden of establishing a prima facie showing of a violation. See 43 C.F.R. § 4.1171(a). Based on this model, we likewise conclude that the Division bears the initial burden of establishing a prima facie showing of a violation under UCMRA.

not supported this portion of its NOV with substantial evidence on the record. See Morton Int'l, 814 P.2d at 585; Utah Code Ann. § 40-10-30(f) (1988) (court will set aside Board's action if an adjudicative proceeding is "unsupported by substantial evidence on the record"). The Division has not established a prima facie showing that Hidden Valley had, between November 1 and November 19, failed to maintain stable diversions at the mine site. In light of the lack of record evidence supporting the Division's position, the Board's decision to uphold this portion of the NOV was arbitrary and capricious. We therefore conclude that the Board erred in upholding this portion of the NOV.

Failure to Minimize Erosion

The Board made no findings with regard to Hidden Valley's alleged failure to "minimize erosion to the extent possible." This court has reiterated that an administrative agency must make findings of fact that are sufficiently detailed so as to permit meaningful appellate review. Adams v. Board of Review of Indus. Comm'n, 821 P.2d 1, 4 (Utah App. 1991).

> In order for us to meaningfully review the findings of the [Board], the findings must be "sufficiently detailed and include enough subsidiary facts to disclose the steps taken by which the ultimate conclusion on each factual issue was reached. . . . [T]he failure of an agency to make adequate findings of fact in material issues renders its findings "arbitrary and capricious" unless the evidence is "clear and uncontroverted and capable of only one conclusion."

Id. at 4-5 (quoting Nyrehn v. Industrial Comm'n, 800 P.2d 330, 335 (Utah App. 1990) (citations omitted), cert. denied, 815 P.2d 241 (Utah 1991)). We may not, however, assume that an undisclosed finding was in fact made. Id. at 5. The party defending the agency's action bears the burden of showing that the undisclosed finding was actually made. Id.

> For this Court to sustain an order, the findings must be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that the [Board] has properly arrived at the ultimate factual findings and has properly applied the governing rules of law to those findings. . . . It is not the prerogative of this Court to search the record to determine whether findings could have been made by the [Board] to support its

> order, for to do so would be to usurp the function with which the [Board] is charged.

Id. (quoting Mountain States Legal Found. v. Public Serv. Comm'n, 636 P.2d 1047, 1052 (Utah 1981)).

Our review of the record reveals no evidence indicating that Hidden Valley failed to take adequate steps to minimize erosion between the November 1 and November 19 inspections. Inspector Malencik testified that, in his opinion, there were several additional steps Hidden Valley could have taken to minimize erosion, but did not identify any specific steps that Hidden Valley had apparently failed to take during that eighteen-day period. The Board made no findings with respect to Hidden Valley's alleged failure to minimize erosion, and there was no evidence presented that would have supported such a finding. In light of the absence of evidence, the Board could not have found that Hidden Valley had, between November 1 and November 19, failed to take all reasonable steps to minimize erosion. We therefore conclude that the Board erred in upholding this portion of the NOV.

Failure to Seed and Revegetate Disturbed Areas

The Board found that Hidden Valley "failed to comply with the Permanent Program standards and the approved Reclamation Plan by having failed to seed the disturbed area constituting the outslopes of the access road." Based on this finding, the Board upheld that portion of the Division's NOV that cited Hidden Valley for failing to seed and revegetate disturbed areas.

There is some dispute in the record as to whether Hidden Valley failed to seed and revegetate the disturbed areas. However, the Division did not introduce any evidence that Hidden Valley had failed to meet seeding and revegetating requirements between November 1 and November 19. Consequently, the Division has not supported this portion of the NOV with substantial evidence on the record. The Division has not established a prima facie showing that Hidden Valley had, between November 1 and November 19, failed to seed and revegetate all disturbed areas at the mine site. In light of the lack of record evidence supporting the Division's position, the Board's decision to uphold this portion of the NOV was arbitrary and capricious. We therefore conclude that the Board erred in upholding this portion of the NOV.

CONCLUSION

The Division failed to establish a prima facie showing of the facts underlying the violations charged in the NOV. We therefore reverse the Board's decision upholding the Division's issuance of the NOV and vacate the Division's penalty assessment against Hidden Valley.

Russell W. Bench, Judge

WE CONCUR:



Norman H. Jackson, Judge



Gregory K. Orme, Judge

Copy

UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

VACATION/TERMINATION OF NOTICE OF VIOLATION/CESSATION ORDER

To the following Permittee or Operator:

Name Hidden Valley Coal Company

Mailing Address 1801 University Drive, Phoenix, AZ 85034

State Permit No. ACT/015/007

Utah Coal Mining & Reclamation Act, Section 40-10-1 et seq., *Utah Code Annotated* (1953):

Notice of Violation No. N 93-35-8-1 dated October 6, 19 93.

Cessation Order No. C _____ dated _____, 19 ____.

Part 1 of 1 is ☑ vacated ☐ terminated ~~because~~ per Stipulated Agreement and ruling in Utah Court of Appeals dated December 1, 1993. (see attached).

Part ____ of ____ is ☐ vacated ☐ terminated because _____

Part ____ of ____ is ☐ vacated ☐ terminated because _____

Date of service/mailing 12/9/93 Time of service/mailing 3:00 ☐ a.m. ☒ p.m.

Permittee/Operator representative _____ Title _____

Signature _____

PAMELA GRUBAUGH-LITTIG Division of Oil, Gas & Mining — Permit Supervisor Title

Signature

WHITE – DOGM YELLOW – OSM PINK – PERMITTEE/OPERATOR GOLDENROD – NOV FILE

Thomas A. Mitchell (3737)
William R. Richards (4398)
3 Triad, Suite 350
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203
Telephone: (801) 538-5340

DEC 0 5 1995

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

HIDDEN VALLEY COAL COMPANY,	:	**STIPULATION**
Plaintiff and Appellant,	:	
v.	:	Case No. 930073-CA
The UTAH BOARD OF OIL, GAS & MINING and the UTAH DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING,	:	Priority 15
Defendants and Appellants.	:	

Appellant and Appellee through counsel of record enter into this Stipulation concerning the following Notice of Violations ("NOVs").

NOV N91-26-8-2 required as a condition of abatement reseeding of the road surface referenced in the NOV. The terms of the 1991 NOV's abatement and the approved abatement plan itself, specifically addressed revegetation for the road surface. NOV N93-35-08-01 was written only for failure to attain perennial vegetation on the road surface, a previously uncited regulation. This failure to meet this performance standard is nonetheless addressed within the scope of the approved abatement plan submitted by Appellant.

The parties therefore stipulate as follows:

1. NOV N93-35-08-01 is hereby vacated;

2. The Appellant's Emergency Motion to Enforce Order dated November 30, 1993, is withdrawn;

3. There shall be no further appeals as to the fact of violation concerning revegetation success on the road surface as it relates to N91-26-8-2;.

4. If Plaintiff Appellants are successful in their appeal of NOV N91-26-8 the Division is not estopped from enforcing revegetation performance standards on the road surface not previously cited in NOV N91-26-8-2 or otherwise argued or raised by Appellants in this proceeding.

The basis for both parties entering into this Stipulation is solely in the Stipulation as set forth above.

SO STIPULATED this 15th day of December, 1993.

Thomas A. Mitchell
Assistant Attorney General
UTAH DIVISION OF OIL,
GAS & MINING

STIRBA & HATHAWAY

BY:_____
BENSON L. HATHAWAY, JR.
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Appellant
Hidden Valley Coal Company

FABIAN & CLENDENIN

BY: _____
DENISE DRAGOO
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Appellant
Hidden Valley Coal Company

CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I hereby certify that on this 3rd day of December, 1993, a true and correct copy of the foregoing STIPULATION was hand delivered to the following:

William R. Richards
Thomas A. Mitchell
Assistants Attorney General
UTAH DIVISION OF OIL,
GAS & MINING
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180

_____

k:\hvcc\stipulation

FILED
Utah Court of Appeals

DEC 01 1993

Mary T. Noonan
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

----ooOoo----

Hidden Valley Coal Company, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. Utah Board of Oil, Gas & Mining and the Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining, Defendants and Appellees.	)	ORDER Case No. 930073-CA

This matter is before the court on appellant's emergency motion to enforce this court's order of April 14, 1993 staying enforcement action on Notice of Violation, No. N91-26-8-2, by extending the effect of the stay order to Notice of Violation, No. N93-35-08-01.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is denied, based upon the issuance of this court's opinion filed December 1, 1993, reversing the district court's decision, and the resulting expiration of the April 14, 1993 stay order.

Dated this 1st day of December, 1993.

BY THE COURT:

Russell W. Bench, Judge

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that on the 21 day of December, 1993, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Order was mailed to each of the following:

Denise A. Dragoo
Attorney at Law
215 South State Street, 12th Floor
P.O. Box 510210
Salt Lake City, UT 84151

Peter Stirba
Benson L. Hathaway, Jr.
Margaret H. Olson
Attorneys at Law
215 South State Street, Suite 1150
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

William R. Richards
Thomas A. Mitchell
Assistant Attorneys General
Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
#3 Triad Center, Suite 350
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84180

Cynthia Callendro
Deputy Clerk

COVER SHEET

CASE TITLE:

Hidden Valley Coal Company,
Plaintiff and Appellant,
v. Case No. 930073-CA
Utah Board of Oil, Gas & Mining
and the Utah Division of Oil,
Gas & Mining,
Defendants and Appellees.

December 1, 1993. OPINION (For Publication).

Opinion of the Court by RUSSELL W. BENCH, Judge; NORMAN H. JACKSON, and GREGORY K. ORME, Judges, concur.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that on the 1st day of December, 1993, a true and correct copy of the foregoing OPINION was deposited in the United States mail to the parties listed below:

Denise A. Dragoo (Argued)
Fabian & Clendenin
Attorneys at Law
215 South State Street, 12th Floor
P.O. Box 510210
Salt Lake City, UT 84151

Peter Stirba (Argued)
Benson L. Hathaway, Jr.
Margaret H. Olson
Stirba & Hathaway
Attorneys at Law
215 South State Street, Suite 1150
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Jan Graham
State Attorney General
William R. Richards (Argued)
Thomas A. Mitchell (Argued)
Assistant Attorneys General
Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
#3 Triad Center, Suite 350
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84180

and a true and correct copy of the foregoing OPINION was deposited in the United States mail to the district court judge listed below:

The Honorable Glenn K. Iwasaki
Third District Judge
240 East 4th South, Room 503
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Deputy Clerk

CalMat
of Arizona

The CalMat Companies

May 12, 1994

VIA FACSIMILE
(801)359-3940

James W. Carter
Director
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

Re: **Hidden Valley Coal Company, Permit No. ACT/015/007**
Erosion Control Plan

Dear Director Carter:

Hidden Valley Coal Company ("HVCC") hereby notifies the Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining (the "Division") of its intent to implement the erosion control portion of its plan for abatement of NOV N91-26-8-2, dated December 8, 1992. By letter dated December 15, 1992, the Division approved this plan and instructed HVCC to notify the Division prior to undertaking abatement measures. The erosion control portion of the plan is set forth at pages 2 through 6. HVCC agrees to proceed with this abatement as soon as practicable after approval, once materials are received and environmental conditions are acceptable. Conditions necessary for work to proceed are: (1) no snow cover; (2) the ground has thawed to allow digging to proceed; and (3) the moisture content of the soil is such that fill slope materials are workable without forming clods. HVCC believes that environmental conditions at the site are now acceptable and proposes to commence work under the approved plan during the week of May 16, 1994. The work will involve a two-person labor crew supervised by JBR Consultants Group, Inc. It is anticipated that the work will take approximately one month to complete.

HVCC is implementing the erosion control portion of the abatement plan, although the Division has vacated NOV N91-26-8-2. As you are aware, the Division vacated this NOV in response to the December 1, 1993 ruling of the Utah Court of Appeals in *Hidden Valley Coal Company v. Utah Board of Oil, Gas & Mining*, Case No. 930073-CA. Pending the court's ruling in that matter, HVCC had obtained a stay from the Court of Appeals dated March 8, 1993, preventing the Division from "issuing, enforcing, implementing or acting upon in any way any notice of violation or cessation order

requiring HVCC to effect or implement its abatement plan for NOV N91-26-8-2." Although the NOV has been vacated and the abatement plan is no longer required, HVCC is proceeding in accordance with the plan as a good faith effort to control erosion on the site to the extent possible.

We appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Lee Edmonson

Lee Edmonson
Manager
Planning & Regulatory Affairs

LE/cn
Enclosures

cc: Karla Knoop
Denise A. Dragoo, Esq.
William Malencik

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

SENDER INSTRUCTIONS

Print your name, address and ZIP Code in the space below.

- Complete items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the reverse.
- Attach to front of article if space permits, otherwise affix to back of article.
- Endorse article "Return Receipt Requested" adjacent to number.

RETURN TO

Print Sender's name, address, and ZIP Code in the space below.

STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
OIL, GAS, & MINING
3 TRIAD CENTER, SUITE 350
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84180-1203

U.S.MAIL

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, $300

3 and 4.
Put your address in the "RETURN TO" space on the reverse side. Failure to do this will prevent this card from being returned to you. The return receipt fee will provide you the name of the person delivered to and the date of delivery. For additional fees the following services are available. Consult postmaster for fees and check box(es) for additional service(s) requested.

1. ☐ Show to whom delivered, date, and addressee's address. (Extra charge)
2. ☐ Restricted Delivery (Extra charge)

3. Article Addressed to:
THOMAS E EHMETT ACTING DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING
RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT
505 MARQUETTE NW SUITE 1200
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87102

4. Article Number
P 074 977 127

Type of Service:
☐ Registered ☐ Insured
☒ Certified ☐ C.O.D.
☐ Express Mail ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise

Always obtain signature of addressee or agent and DATE DELIVERED.

5. Signature — Address
X

6. Signature — Agent
X

7. Date of Delivery
5/31/94

8. Addressee's Address (ONLY if requested and fee paid)

PS Form 3811, Mar. 1988 ★ U.S.G.P.O. 1988-212-865 DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT

DOGM JBE ACT/015/007 #5

STICK POSTAGE STAMPS TO ARTICLE TO COVER FIRST CLASS POSTAGE, CERTIFIED MAIL FEE, AND CHARGES FOR ANY SELECTED OPTIONAL SERVICES. (see front)

1. If you want this receipt postmarked, stick the gummed stub to the right of the return address leaving the receipt attached and present the article at a post office service window or hand it to your rural carrier. (No extra charge)

2. If you do not want this receipt postmarked, stick the gummed stub to the right of the return address of the article, date, detach and retain the receipt, and mail the article.

3. If you want a return receipt, write the certified mail number and your name and address on a return receipt card, Form 3811, and attach it to the front of the article by means of the gummed ends if space permits. Otherwise, affix to back of article. Endorse front of article RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED adjacent to the number.

4. If you want delivery restricted to the addressee, or to an authorized agent of the addressee, endorse RESTRICTED DELIVERY on the front of the article.

5. Enter fees for the services requested in the appropriate spaces on the front of this receipt. If return receipt is requested, check the applicable blocks in item 1 of Form 3811.

6. Save this receipt and present it if you make inquiry.

★ U.S.G.P.O. 1988-217-132

DOGM JBE ACT/015/007 #5

PS Form 3800, June 1985

P 074 977 127

RECEIPT FOR CERTIFIED MAIL
NO INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVIDED
NOT FOR INTERNATIONAL MAIL
(See Reverse)

Sent to
THOMAS E EHMETT ACTING DIRECTO
OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING
RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT
505 MARQUETTE NW SUITE 1200
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87102

Postage	$ .75
Certified Fee	1.00
Special Delivery Fee	
Restricted Delivery Fee	
Return Receipt showing to whom and Date Delivered	1.00
Return Receipt showing to whom, Date, and Address of Delivery	
TOTAL Postage and Fees	$ 2.75
Postmark or Date	