0005

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

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

December 15, 1989

TO: Pamela Grubaugh-Littig, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Henry Sauer, Reclamation Soils Specialist

RE: **Technical Deficiency Review, Five-Year Permit Renewal Application, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Trail Mountain #9 Mine, ACT/015/009, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah**

UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements-(HS)

The final reclamation plan is partially contingent upon the conclusions drawn from data obtained from the revegetation test plots (i.e., introduced vs. native seed mixtures). Additionally, the test plots were designed to demonstrate the suitability of existing fill material (proposed substitute topsoil) as a plant growth medium for final reclamation.

The applicant's plan to regrade, topsoil, revegetate, and provide erosion control, etc., is inadequate and contradictory. Reclamation commitments within the PAP (Chapters III and VIII) do not reflect commitments and reclamation procedures elucidated in Appendix 9-1 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting). Although conclusions regarding reclamation feasibility and site specific revegetation techniques are partially dependent upon the results from the revegetation test plots, general reclamation procedures should be predictable at this time. Therefore, the operator must submit for Division review, a revised version of the reclamation plan which reflects preliminary test plot results, original reclamation plan (i.e., Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting), Division memo (i.e., Dan Duce, Rclamation Soils Specialist, dated February 24, 1988), existing PAP text, etc.

The applicant states "if future disturbance uncovers or encounters salvagable soil, Beaver Creek Coal Company will remove, stockpile, and stabilize soil (pages 3-52 and 3-57). This statement must include verbage which commits to analyzing said materials prior to removal (UMC 817.21[a]) and in accordance with Division Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 1.

UMC 817.22 Topsoil: Removal-(HS)

Revegetation test plot data indicates relatively successful revegetation. Continued monitoring (i.e., fifth year, ninth year, and tenth year) of the plots may reveal vegetation sustainability and reference area comparability. As a reminder, the applicant is required to submit test plot vegetation surveys conducted in the summer of 1989. These results must be submitted in the Annual Report (April 1990).

Review of the soils data collected in 1987 indicate the following:

1. Surficial salt activity (Electrical Conductivity-E.C.) is lower than salt activity in the lower profile.

2. Field inspections of the test plot soil and the existing fill material indicates lower bulk density within the test plot soils.

3. A soil moisture deficit exists during the majority of the growing season (i.e., high evapotranspiration potential: low effective precipitation).

Preliminary Conclusions: Salt is being leached down through the profile or salt activity in the lower profile has not had adequate time to migrate up through the profile. Since both hypotheses are feasible, continued analyses of the salt activity (E.C.) at various depths within the profile is required.

Hence, E.C. must be analyzed at various depths throughout the test plot soil profile in the spring (late May/early June) and fall (mid-September) of 1994.

UMC 817.24 Topsoil: Redistribution-(HS)

(Refer to comments under UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements.)

In what manner will the stockpiled topsoil be redistributed (i.e., veneer the surface of regraded soils/spoils, redistribute upon areas where the material was derived, etc.)?

The applicant states (page 8-10, Section 3.5.4.1 and page 3-57) "Upon abandonment the postmining land use will not require extensive backfilling and grading." Accordingly, many areas which remain unaltered by backfilling and grading operations as well as those areas which incur intense machinery traffic will be highly compacted. The applicant must commit to deep ripping regraded spoil/soils and disking topsoil if surface compaction is high. Please specify the approximate depth of deep ripping and disking.

UMC 817.25 Topsoil: Nutrients and Amendments-(HS)

How will the need for fertilizer and/or soil amendments be determined (i.e., sampling program, constituent to be analyzed)?

UMC 817.48 Hydrologic Balance: Acid- and Toxic-Forming Materials-(HS)

The applicant states in Appendix 9, page 16 through 17B that "during grading, cut and fill operations, unsuitable materials will be buried with four feet of material." How will unsuitable material (i.e., Oil and Grease, Selenium, Acid-Forming Potential, etc.) be identified, and what sampling and laboratory methods will be employed to determine suitability?

The applicant must commit to sample and analyze sediment pond waste material prior to removal. Samples must be analyzed in accordance with the Division's Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 6. Please incorporate similar verbage in appropriate sections of the PAP.

All excess soil, sediment pond waste, etc., temporarily disposed of on the surface, must be bermed and analyzed for its acid and/or toxic forming potential if stored on the surface for more than seven calendar days. Please make necessary PAP text changes.

UMC 817.71 Disposal of Excess Spoil and Underground Development Waste: General Requirements-(HS)

Reference regarding refuse disposal in an approved landfill (page 3-24 and 3-48) are unacceptable (UMC 817.71[a]). All such verbage must be deleted from the PAP.

UMC 817.113 Revegetation: Timing-(HS)

Seeding and planting of disturbed areas must be conducted during the first normal period for favorable planting conditions and after final site preparation. Please incorporate such language on page 3-57 of the PAP.

If a land imprinter is utilized, seed must be broadcast immediately before imprinting. Additionally, the land imprinter is most effective when the seedbed is light textured or loose from disking or plowing. The applicant must incorporate such language into the PAP and insure that the land imprinter actually imprints the surface of the soil/spoil as designed.

UMC 817.114 Revegetation: Mulching and Other Soil Stabilizing Practices-(HS)

The applicant indicates that surface erosion control will be provided, utilizing erosion control matting or wood fiber mulch (page 3-51). In Appendix 9-1, page 14 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting Report), the applicant commits to cover the entire reclaimed area with erosion control matting. It should be noted that given the final slope configurations, the proximity to a perennial fishery stream and the high silt and clay fraction within the proposed substitute topsoil, erosion control matting should cover the entire reclaimed site. Additionally, it is imperative that erosion control matting be installed in strict accordance with manufacturer's specifications. Please incorporate preceeeding verbage within the PAP.

djh
AT97/21-24

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

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

January 19, 1990

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

Dear Mr. Guy:

Re: **Technical Deficiency Items, Five-Year Permit Renewal Application, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Trail Mountain #9 Mine, ACT/015/009, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah**

Enclosed is the Technical Deficiency document for the Trail Mountain #9 Mine. The reclamation plan needs to be reorganized into a cohesive section and all of the necessary details included.

Please address these items by January 31, 1990. The technical analysis written by our office must be completed by February 15, 1990.

Sincerely,

Pamela Grubaugh-Littig
Permit Supervisor

djh
Enclosure
AT45/130

TECHNICAL DEFICIENCIES
TRAIL MOUNTAIN #9 MINE
ACT/015/009

Beaver Creek Coal Company
Emery County, Utah
January 19, 1990

UMC 800 Bonding-(PGL)

The reclamation bond estimate must be updated to incorporate all changes to be consistent with the reclamation plan.

UMC 817.11 Signs and Markers-(PGL)

The applicant must state the duration of time that signs will be maintained at the Trail Mountain #9 Mine for inclusion in the PAP (page 3-22).

UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements-(HS)

The final reclamation plan is partially contingent upon the conclusions drawn from data obtained from the revegetation test plots (i.e., introduced vs. native seed mixtures). Additionally, the test plots were designed to demonstrate the suitability of existing fill material (proposed substitute topsoil) as a plant growth medium for final reclamation.

The applicant's plan to regrade, topsoil, revegetate, and provide erosion control, etc., is inadequate and contradictory. Reclamation commitments within the PAP (Chapters III and VIII) do not reflect commitments and reclamation procedures elucidated in Appendix 9-1 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting). Although conclusions regarding reclamation feasibility and site specific revegetation techniques are partially dependent upon the results from the revegetation test plots, general reclamation procedures should be predictable at this time. Therefore, the operator must submit for Division review, a revised version of the reclamation plan which reflects preliminary test plot results, original reclamation plan (i.e., Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting), Division memo (i.e., Dan Duce, Reclamation Soils Specialist, dated February 24, 1988), existing PAP text, and etc.

The applicant states "if future disturbance uncovers or encounters salvagable soil, Beaver Creek Coal Company will remove, stockpile, and stabilize soil (pages 3-52 and 3-57)." This statement must include verbage which commits to analyzing said materials prior to removal (UMC 817.21[a]) and in accordance with Division Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 1.

UMC 817.22 Topsoil: Removal-(HS)

Revegetation test plot data indicates relatively successful revegetation. Continued monitoring (i.e., fifth year, ninth year, and tenth year) of the plots may reveal vegetation sustainability and reference area compatibility. As a reminder, the applicant is required to submit test plot vegetation surveys conducted in the summer of 1989. These results must be submitted in the Annual Report (April 1990).

Review of the soils data collected in 1987 indicate the following:

1. Surficial salt activity (Electrical Conductivity-E.C.) is lower than salt activity in the lower profile.

2. Field inspections of the test plot soil and the existing fill material indicates lower bulk density within the test plot soils.

3. A soil moisture deficit exists during the majority of the growing season (i.e., high evapotranspiration potential: low effective precipitation).

Preliminary Conclusions: Salt is being leached down through the profile or salt activity in the lower profile has not had adequate time to migrate up through the profile. Since both hypotheses are feasible, continued analyses of the salt activity (E.C.) at various depths within the profile is required.

Hence, E.C. must be analyzed at various depths throughout the test plot soil profile in the spring (late May/early June) and fall (mid-Septembere) of 1994.

UMC 817.24 Topsoil: Redistribution-(HS)

(Refer to comments under UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements).

The applicant must state the manner in which the stockpiled topsoil will be redistributed (i.e., veneer the surface of regraded soils/spoils, redistribute upon areas where the material was derived, etc.).

The applicant states (page 8-10, Section 3.5.4.1 and page 3-57) "Upon abandonment the postmining land use will not require extensive backfilling and grading." Accordingly, many areas which remain unaltered by backfilling and grading operations as well as those areas which incur intense machinery traffic will be highly compacted. The applicant must commit to deep ripping regraded spoil/soils and disking topsoil if surface compaction is high. Please specify the approximate depth of deep ripping and disking.

UMC 817.25 Topsoil: Nutrients and Amendments-(HS)

The applicant must state how the need for fertilizer and/or soil amendments will be determined (i.e., sampling program, constituent to be analyzed).

UMC 817.41 Hydrologic Balance: General Requirements-(TM)

The applicant needs to update the water quality plans and data submitted in the PAP into a cohesive updated section, providing a data summary or reference to an annual report. This section must provide a table listing all water monitoring sites and monitoring frequencies.

The elimination of data sheets and figures other than updated materials is necessary to condense the PAP. Figure 7-9 needs to be updated to reflect current references to appendices in the PAP and show all monitoring locations including 26-4P.

UMC 817.42 Hydrologic Balance: Water Quality Standards and Effluent Limitations-(TM)

The applicant has not provided enough detail regarding site plans for erosion and sediment control methodologies that will be employed during active mining and reclamation. The applicant must provide a site plan which will provide the necessary details to show what Best Technology Currently Available (BCTA) will be used to treat all affected areas, both during active operations and mining.

Tables in the PAP must summarize the areas to be treated by BTCA for both the current operations and reclamation of the site. The information in the table will delineate drainage area size and treatment methodology for all permitted areas which will not report directly to a sediment pond. The table in the PAP will include an area number from a figure or plate which identifies the area and treatment. The term "small area exemption" does not apply unless the area is revegetated and released from bonding requirements.

It is prudent that the applicant consider leaving a sediment pond in place following reclamation, or a modified version of the current pond to alleviate concerns regarding sediment control during reclamation.

The applicant must organize the plan in a manner which allows the reader to refer to calculations referenced by an explanation in the text. References generally were not correct, and as a general comment, the whole reclamation plan is very disorganized, although basic information is available and scattered throughout appendices in the PAP.

The applicant needs to reorganize the reclamation plan into a cohesive section and modify the plan to provide the necessary details.

UMC 817.43 Diversions-(TM)

The applicant must supply information regarding the design capacity of the 66-inch bypass culvert for Cottonwood Creek. Specifically, four additional inlets along the County Road tie into the bypass system. The applicant must show how these drainage areas are considered in the design calculations (inlet above lower gate adjacent to fence, two inlets across from main gate on west side of road, and one inlet just north of the 96-inch culvert inlet).

Drawings must be updated to reflect two additional drainages into the sedimentation pond (a total of three inlets to the pond). A fourth inlet has been identified as the mine water discharge pipe, and also needs to be shown. An additional undisturbed ditch draining into the sediment pond from a small disturbed area identified in the field as draining a 25 foot x 15 foot area needs to be shown on a map and sized in the PAP.

UMC 817.44 Stream Channel Diversions-(TM)

The operator presents reclamation plans for both the main channel of Cottonwood Creek and the side canyon draining into Cottonwood Creek. The calculations and plans for both of these drainages calls for installation of check dams and riprap sized by riprap nomographs. The applicant has presented some questionable designs regarding no riprap placement in the channel bottoms. This design parameter is not acceptable to the Division.

No sediment control for channel reconstruction has been recommended because the applicant considers it not practical. The Division feels that the installation of check dams will provide temporary sediment control until the channel has stabilized following construction. A detailed explanation of how these check dams will be installed is necessary to complete the PAP and an explanation of how they will provide sediment control is required.

UMC 817.48 Hydrologic Balance: Acid- and Toxic-Forming Materials-(HS)

The applicant states in Appendix 9, page 16 through 17B that "during grading, cut and fill operations, unsuitable materials will be buried with four feet of material." The applicant must state how unsuitable material (i.e., Oil and Grease, Selenium, Acid-Forming Potential, etc.) will be identified, and what sampling and laboratory methods will be employed to determine suitability.

The applicant must commit to sample and analyze sediment pond waste material prior to removal. Samples must be analyzed in accordance with the Division's Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 6. Please incorporate similar verbage in appropriate sections of the PAP.

All excess soil, sediment pond waste, etc., temporarily disposed of on the surface, must be bermed and analyzed for its acid- and/or toxic-forming potential if stored on the surface for more than seven calendar days. Please make necessary PAP text changes.

UMC 817.71 Disposal of Excess Spoil and Underground Development Waste: General Requirements-(HS)

References regarding refuse disposal in an approved landfill (page 3-24 and 3-48) are unacceptable (UMC 817.71[a]). All such verbage must be deleted from the PAP.

UMC 817.89 Disposal of Noncoal Wastes-(PGL)

The applicant must update the disposal of noncoal waste at this mine site (page 3-48) for inclusion in the PAP.

UMC 817.113 Revegetation: Timinig-(HS)

Seeding and planting of disturbed areas must be conducted during the first normal period for favorable planting conditions and after final site preparation. Please incorporate such language on page 3-57 of the PAP.

If a land imprinter is utilized, seed must be broadcast immediately before imprinting. Additionally, the land imprinter is most effective when the seedbed is light textured or loose from disking or plowing. The applicant must incorporate such language into the PAP and insure that the land imprinter actually imprints the surface of the soil/spoil as designed.

UMC 817.114 Revegetation: Mulching and Other Soil Stabilizing Practices-(HS)

The applicant indicates that surface erosion control will be provided, utilizing erosion control matting or wood fiber mulch (page 3-51). In Appendix 9-1, page 14 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting Report), the applicant commits to cover the entire reclaimed area with erosion control matting. It should be noted that given the final slope configurations, the proximity to a perennial fishery stream and the high silt and clay fraction within the proposed substitute topsoil, erosion control matting should cover the entire reclaimed site. Additionally, it is imperative that erosion control matting be installed in strict accordance with manufacturer's specifications. Please incorporate this information into the PAP.

djh
AT107/8-12

BEAVER CREEK Coal Company
Post Office Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501
Telephone 801 637-5050

February 15, 1990

Ms. Pamela Grubaugh-Littig
Permit Supervisor
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
355 West North Temple
#3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

Re: 5- Year Permit Renewal
Technical Deficiency Response
Trail Mountain No.9 Mine
ACT/015/009
Emery County, Utah

Dear Ms. Littig:

Enclosed are 3 copies each of the remainder of the Beaver Creek response to the Technical Deficiencies for the Trail Mountain No.9 Mine Permit Renewal. Also enclosed is a check list indicating response locations. All pages and plates are numbered and should replace corresponding numbers in the plan.

If you have any questions, or need any further information, please give me a call.

Respectfully,

Dan W. Guy
Mgr. Permitting/Compliance

cc: Johnny Coffey
File

TECHNICAL DEFICIENCIES
TRAIL MOUNTAIN #9 MINE
ACT/015/009

Beaver Creek Coal Company
Emery County, Utah
January 19, 1990

UMC 800 Bonding-(PGL)

Bond Updated - 1988. No changes requiring bond adjustment since then.

The reclamation bond estimate must be updated to incorporate all changes to be consistent with the reclamation plan.

UMC 817.11 Signs and Markers-(PGL)

Sec. 3.3.5; p. 3-22.

The applicant must state the duration of time that signs will be maintained at the Trail Mountain #9 Mine for inclusion in the PAP (page 3-22).

UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements-(HS)

The final reclamation plan is partially contingent upon the conclusions drawn from data obtained from the revegetation test plots (i.e., introduced vs. native seed mixtures). Additionally, the test plots were designed to demonstrate the suitability of existing fill material (proposed substitute topsoil) as a plant growth medium for final reclamation.

The applicant's plan to regrade, topsoil, revegetate, and provide erosion control, etc., is inadequate and contradictory. Reclamation commitments within the PAP (Chapters III and VIII) do not reflect commitments and reclamation procedures elucidated in Appendix 9-1 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting). Although conclusions regarding reclamation feasibility and site specific revegetation techniques are partially dependent upon the results from the revegetation test plots, general reclamation procedures should be predictable at this time. Therefore, the operator must submit for Division review, a revised version of the reclamation plan which reflects preliminary test plot results, original reclamation plan (i.e., Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting), Division memo (i.e., Dan Duce, Reclamation Soils Specialist, dated February 24, 1988), existing PAP text, and etc.

Sec. 3.5; App. 9-1; App. 9-2.

The applicant states "if future disturbance uncovers or encounters salvagable soil, Beaver Creek Coal Company will remove, stockpile, and stabilize soil (pages 3-52 and 3-57)." This statement must include verbage which commits to analyzing said materials prior to removal (UMC 817.21[a]) and in accordance with Division Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 1.

Sec. 3.5.2, p. 3-52; Sec. 3.5.4.3, p 3-57.

UMC 817.22 Topsoil: Removal-(HS)

Revegetation test plot data indicates relatively successful revegetation. Continued monitoring (i.e., fifth year, ninth year, and tenth year) of the plots may reveal vegetation sustainability and reference area compatibility. As a reminder, the applicant is required to submit test plot vegetation surveys conducted in the summer of 1989. These results must be submitted in the Annual Report (April 1990). App. 9-2; Annual Report.

Review of the soils data collected in 1987 indicate the following:

1. Surficial salt activity (Electrical Conductivity-E.C.) is lower than salt activity in the lower profile.

2. Field inspections of the test plot soil and the existing fill material indicates lower bulk density within the test plot soils.

3. A soil moisture deficit exists during the majority of the growing season (i.e., high evapotranspiration potential: low effective precipitation).

Preliminary Conclusions: Salt is being leached down through the profile or salt activity in the lower profile has not had adequate time to migrate up through the profile. Since both hypotheses are feasible, continued analyses of the salt activity (E.C.) at various depths within the profile is required.

Hence, E.C. must be analyzed at various depths throughout the test plot soil profile in the spring (late May/early June) and fall (mid-Septembere) of 1994.

UMC 817.24 Topsoil: Redistribution-(HS)

(Refer to comments under UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements).

The applicant must state the manner in which the stockpiled topsoil will be redistributed (i.e., veneer the surface of regraded soils/spoils, redistribute upon areas where the material was derived, etc.).

Sec. 3.5.4.1, p 3-57.

The applicant states (page 8-10, Section 3.5.4.1 and page 3-57) "Upon abandonment the postmining land use will not require extensive backfilling and grading." Accordingly, many areas which remain unaltered by backfilling and grading operations as well as those areas which incur intense machinery traffic will be highly compacted. The applicant must commit to deep ripping regraded spoil/soils and disking topsoil if surface compaction is high. Please specify the approximate depth of deep ripping and disking.

UMC 817.25 Topsoil: Nutrients and Amendments-(HS)

The applicant must state how the need for fertilizer and/or soil amendments will be determined (i.e., sampling program, constituent to be analyzed). p. 3-51

UMC 817.41 Hydrologic Balance: General Requirements-(TM)

Appendix 7-1; Appendix 7-2.

The applicant needs to update the water quality plans and data submitted in the PAP into a cohesive updated section, providing a data summary or reference to an annual report. This section must provide a table listing all water monitoring sites and monitoring frequencies.

The elimination of data sheets and figures other than updated materials is necessary to condense the PAP. Figure 7-9 needs to be updated to reflect current references to appendices in the PAP and show all monitoring locations including 26-4P. Sec. 7.4; App. 7-1; Fig. 7-9.

UMC 817.42 Hydrologic Balance: Water Quality Standards and Effluent Limitations-(TM)

Sec. 7.2.4.2. Fig. 3-16, 7-11.

The applicant has not provided enough detail regarding site plans for erosion and sediment control methodologies that will be employed during active mining and reclamation. The applicant must provide a site plan which will provide the necessary details to show what Best Technology Currently Available (BCTA) will be used to treat all affected areas, both during active operations and mining.

Tables in the PAP must summarize the areas to be treated by BTCA for both the current operations and reclamation of the site. The information in the table will delineate drainage area size and treatment methodology for all permitted areas which will not report directly to a sediment pond. The table in the PAP will include an area number from a figure or plate which identifies the area and treatment. The term "small area exemption" does not apply unless the area is revegetated and released from bonding requirements. Sec. 7.2.4.2, p. 7-52a. Fig. 3-16.

It is prudent that the applicant consider leaving a sediment pond in place following reclamation, or a modified version of the current pond to alleviate concerns regarding sediment control during reclamation. Sec. 7.4, Plates 3-12, 3-12A.

The applicant must organize the plan in a manner which allows the reader to refer to calculations referenced by an explanation in the text. References generally were not correct, and as a general comment, the whole reclamation plan is very disorganized, although basic information is available and scattered throughout appendices in the PAP. Sec. 7.4

The applicant needs to reorganize the reclamation plan into a cohesive section and modify the plan to provide the necessary details. Sec. 7.4

UMC 817.43 Diversions-(TM)

Sec. 7.2.4.2, p. 7-49. Figure 7-11; App 7-3.

The applicant must supply information regarding the design capacity of the 66-inch bypass culvert for Cottonwood Creek. Specifically, four additional inlets along the County Road tie into the bypass system. The applicant must show how these drainage areas are considered in the design calculations (inlet above lower gate adjacent to fence, two inlets across from main gate on west side of road, and one inlet just north of the 96-inch culvert inlet).

Drawings must be updated to reflect two additional drainages into the sedimentation pond (a total of three inlets to the pond). A fourth inlet has been identified as the mine water discharge pipe, and also needs to be shown. An additional undisturbed ditch draining into the sediment pond from a small disturbed area identified in the field as draining a 25 foot x 15 foot area needs to be shown on a map and sized in the PAP.

Fig. 7-11, Table 7-8, p. 7-53; Sec. 7.2.4.2, p. 7-52.

UMC 817.44 Stream Channel Diversions-(TM)

The operator presents reclamation plans for both the main channel of Cottonwood Creek and the side canyon draining into Cottonwood Creek. The calculations and plans for both of these drainages calls for installation of check dams and riprap sized by riprap nomographs. The applicant has presented some questionable designs regarding no riprap placement in the channel bottoms. This design parameter is not acceptable to the Division.

Sec. 7.4.2, p 7-70; Sec. 7.4.3, p. 7-72.

No sediment control for channel reconstruction has been recommended because the applicant considers it not practical. The Division feels that the installation of check dams will provide temporary sediment control until the channel has stabilized following construction. A detailed explanation of how these check dams will be installed is necessary to complete the PAP and an explanation of how they will provide sediment control is required.

Sec. 7.4.2, p 7-71

UMC 817.48 Hydrologic Balance: Acid- and Toxic-Forming Materials-(HS)

Sec. 3.4.9, p. 3-48.

The applicant states in Appendix 9, page 16 through 17B that "during grading, cut and fill operations, unsuitable materials will be buried with four feet of material." The applicant must state how unsuitable material (i.e., Oil and Grease, Selenium, Acid-Forming Potential, etc.) will be identified, and what sampling and laboratory methods will be employed to determine suitability.

Sec. 3.4.9, p. 3-48.

The applicant must commit to sample and analyze sediment pond waste material prior to removal. Samples must be analyzed in accordance with the Division's Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 6. Please incorporate similar verbage in appropriate sections of the PAP.

Sec. 3.4.9, p. 3-48.

All excess soil, sediment pond waste, etc., temporarily disposed of on the surface, must be bermed and analyzed for its acid- and/or toxic-forming potential if stored on the surface for more than seven calendar days. Please make necessary PAP text changes.

UMC 817.71 Disposal of Excess Spoil and Underground Development Waste: General Requirements-(HS)

Sec. 3.3.5.3, p. 3-24; Sec. 3.4.9, p. 3-48.

References regarding refuse disposal in an approved landfill (page 3-24 and 3-48) are unacceptable (UMC 817.71[a]). All such verbage must be deleted from the PAP.

UMC 817.89 Disposal of Noncoal Wastes-(PGL)

Sec. 3.4.9, p 3-48.

The applicant must update the disposal of noncoal waste at this mine site (page 3-48) for inclusion in the PAP.

UMC 817.113 Revegetation: Timinig-(HS)

Sec. 3.5.5, p. 3-57A.

Seeding and planting of disturbed areas must be conducted during the first normal period for favorable planting conditions and after final site preparation. Please incorporate such language on page 3-57 of the PAP.

Appendix 9-1, pp. 10A-10B.

If a land imprinter is utilized, seed must be broadcast immediately before imprinting. Additionally, the land imprinter is most effective when the seedbed is light textured or loose from disking or plowing. The applicant must incorporate such language into the PAP and insure that the land imprinter actually imprints the surface of the soil/spoil as designed.

UMC 817.114 Revegetation: Mulching and Other Soil Stabilizing Practices-(HS)

Sec. 3.5; App. 9-1.

The applicant indicates that surface erosion control will be provided, utilizing erosion control matting or wood fiber mulch (page 3-51). In Appendix 9-1, page 14 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting Report), the applicant commits to cover the entire reclaimed area with erosion control matting. It should be noted that given the final slope configurations, the proximity to a perennial fishery stream and the high silt and clay fraction within the proposed substitute topsoil, erosion control matting should cover the entire reclaimed site. Additionally, it is imperative that erosion control matting be installed in strict accordance with manufacturer's specifications. Please incorporate this information into the PAP.

djh
AT107/8-12

BEAVER CREEK Coal Company
Post Office Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501
Telephone 801 637-5050

February 6, 1990

Ms. Pamela Grubaugh-Littig
Permit Supervisor
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
355 West North Temple
#3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

RE: 5-Year Permit Renewal
Technical Deficiency Response
Trail Mountain No. 9 Mine
ACT/015/009; #3
Emery County, Utah

Dear Ms. Littig:

Enclosed are 3 copies each of the partial Beaver Creek response to the Technical Deficiencies for the Trail Mountain No. 9 Mine Permit Renewal. Also enclosed is a check list indicating response locations or expected dates of response. All pages and plates are numbered and should replace corresponding numbers in the plan.

As discussed, remaining comment responses will be provided to the Division by February 15, 1990. I appreciate your cooperation and willingness to work with Beaver Creek on this response, and particularly, your understanding of our delay due to unforeseen problems. If you have any questions, or need any further information on this submittal, please give me a call.

Respectfully,

Dan W. Guy
Mgr. Permitting/Compliance

cc: Johnny Coffey
File

BEAVER CREEK Coal Company
Post Office Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501
Telephone 801 637-5050

November 30, 1989

Mr. Rick Smith
Permit Supervisor
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

RE: Initial Completeness Review
Five Year Permit Renewal
Trail Mountain No.9 Mine
ACT/015/009; #2
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Smith:

Enclosed are 3 copies of the Beaver Creek Coal Company's response to your Initial Completeness Review of 11/8/89 for the Trail Mountain No.9 Mine Permit Renewal.

The pages and plates are numbered, and should replace corresponding numbers in the plan, or be added at designated locations. A checklist is also enclosed to identify the response location.

If you have any questions, or need any further information, please let me know.

Respectfully,

Dan W. Guy
Mgr. Permitting/Compliance

cc: Johnny Coffey
File

INITIAL COMPLETENESS REVIEW
TRAIL MOUNTAIN #9 MINE
ACT/015/009

Beaver Creek Coal Company
Emery County, Utah
November 8, 1989

UMC 771.23 Permit Applications-General Requirements for Format and Contents-(PGL)

App. 3-6

(c) The technical data in the PAP must be accompanied by the following:

(1) Names of persons or organizations which collected and analyzed the data;

(2) Dates of collection and analyses; and

(3) Descriptions of methodologies used to collect and analyze the data.

The submittal should be compiled as an appendix for all of this information.

UMC 782.19 Identification of Other Licenses and Permits-(PGL)

App. 2-5

(b) Appendix 2-5 (Other Licenses and Permits) does not list the address of the authorities issuing other permits. Please submit this information.

UMC 782.21 Newspaper Advertisement and Proof of Publication-(PGL)

App. 2-7

An error is contained in the proposed public notice. In Section 25, T17S, R6E, ...Beginning at a point of SW corner of SW1/4 SE1/4, etc. This should read...."SW corner of NW1/4 SE1/4". Please correct.

UMC 783.14 Geology Description-(HS)

Sec. 6.7.3, p. 6-11; App. 6-2

(a)(1)(iii) The applicant must submit two sets of roof and floor analyses from Tract II, the Northwest and Southwest borders of the South Main Entry. Constituent analyses and laboratory methodologies must be conducted in accordance with the Division's Guidelines for the Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 6.

Additionally, the operator must commit to annually sampling roof and floor material and analyzing said material as outlined above. Sampling locations should be representative of the material to be encountered in the forthcoming year. Results should be included in the annual monitoring report.

N/A (per discussion)

UMC 783.19 Vegetation Information-(WJM)

Sec. 3.5.5.3, p. 3-59.

The applicant states in the reclamation plan that if the area is heavily grazed "by wildlife, cattle, or rodents, the area will be appropriately protected..." (Sec. 3.5.5.3, page 3-59). The applicant must commit to protecting the reclaimed area from livestock grazing, preferrably by fence, until bond release.

UMC 783.21 Soil Resources Information-(HS)

App. 9-2 (previously submitted)

(b) The applicant must submit results from soils and vegetation surveys conducted since 1987 on the Vegetation Test Plots. Additionally, these results must be incorporated into the report by P. Collins entitled, "Soil and Vegetation Test Plot Monitoring at the Trail Mountain Coal Mine, Appendix 9-2."

UMC 783.24 Maps: General Requirements-(PGL/WJM/HS)

App. 8-1; Fig. 3-16. { No Fig. 3-1A in Plan.

The applicant refers to Plate 3-1A, which depicts the stream culvert borrow pit. This plate has been omitted from the permit application package. Please resubmit Plate 3-1A.

New Fig. 10-3

The applicant must update Figure 10-3 (Sec. 10-6), Stream Buffer Zone Map dated July 1981, to reflect current conditions as shown in Figure 3-16, Contemporaneous Reclamation (SAE).

Fig. 4-2

(a) The surface ownership map, Plate 4-2, must be corrected; i.e., the USFS ownership is non-contiguous in Section 36 and must be corrected.

UMC 784.14 Reclamation Plan: Protection of Hydrologic Balance-(TM/WW)

Sec. 7.2.4; Appendix 7-3.

(b)(1) The operator must supply a plan for control, in accordance with UMC 817, of surface water drainage into, through, and out of, the proposed mine plan area.

Fig. 7-11

Drainage areas must be delineated on a figure, plate or map to support all calculations found in the PAP. This must include sizing of the ponds, diversions, and culverts.

UMC 784.18 Relocation or Use of Public Roads-(TM/WW)

Sec. 3.2.10, p. 3-6; Appendix 3-5

(a) Please provide documentation (approval from Emery County or other regulatory authority) in accordance with UMC 761.12(d) that approves conducting coal mining activities within 100 feet of the right-of-way line of public road 040.

BEAVER CREEK Coal Company
Post Office Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501
Telephone 801 637-5050

October 17, 1989

Mr. Rick Smith
Permit Supervisor
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & mining
355 West North Temple
#3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

RE: Permit Renewal
Trail Mountain No.9 Mine
ACT/015/009
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Smith,

Beaver Creek Coal Company is hereby applying for renewal of the Mining and Reclamation Permit No. ACT/015/009 for its Trail Mountain No.9 Mine. This application is submitted in accordance with the provisions of UMC 788.13 through 788.15.

It should be noted that no major permit changes have occurred since the issuance of the original permit in February 1985, or the subsequent Mid-term review and approval in December, 1988. Minor changes and other required information are enclosed, in accordance with the following listed provisions of UMC 788.14:

(a) Contents: Updated copies of all revisions or amendments to the plan have recently been submitted for inclusion in the M.R.P. There are no outstanding amendments; therefore, existing plans should be complete and updated with the addition of the enclosed information;

(1) The name and address of the permittee is shown in Section 2.2.1 (p.2-1) of the M.R.P.; The permit number is ACT/015/009, as shown in Appendix 2-5 of the M.R.P. The requested term of permit renewal is 5 years, as described in Section 2.6 (p2-11) of the original approved permit - minor changes or amendments have been placed into the permit on an on-going, as-approved basis.

(2) A proposed new Public Notice for Permit Renewal is attached to this application - this is a new Appendix (2-7), and should be added to the M.R.P. in the Chapter 2 Appendices Section.

(3) An insurance liability policy is shown as Appendix 2-3 of the M.R.P.

(b) Processing and Review

(1) Public notice will be filed in accordance with UMC 786.11(a) - see attached Appendix 2-7;

(2) This application for renewal does not extend beyond the boundaries of the existing, approved permit;

(3) N/A - no new land areas are included with this application;

(4) There have been no modifications or amendments to the permit that have required any change in the existing performance bond for the property; (See Appendix 2-4).

Also enclosed with the application are copies of the most recent monitoring results.

The results of water monitoring should be added to Appendix 7-2. The results of the vegetation monitoring should be added to Appendix 9-2, and the subsidence monitoring report should be added to Appendix 12-4.

Ownership information, as shown in Chapter 2 of the M.R.P., is up-to-date; however, an updated Compliance History is enclosed and should replace the existing Appendix 2-2. A $5.00 filing fee is also enclosed with the application.

Three (3) copies each of the above listed items are enclosed with this submittal. Additional copies will be sent at your request.

It is our hope this application will meet with your approval. If you have any questions or need any further information, please let me know.

Respectfully,

Dan W. Guy
Mgr. Permitting/Compliance

cc: R.D. Pick, without enclosures
J.L. Coffey " "
B.H. Biersdorf " "

BEAVER CREEK Coal Company
Post Office Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501
Telephone 801 637-5050

November 30, 1989

Mr. Rick Smith
Permit Supervisor
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

RE: Initial Completeness Review
Five Year Permit Renewal
Trail Mountain No.9 Mine
ACT/015/009; #2
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Smith:

Enclosed are 3 copies of the Beaver Creek Coal Company's response to your Initial Completeness Review of 11/8/89 for the Trail Mountain No.9 Mine Permit Renewal.

The pages and plates are numbered, and should replace corresponding numbers in the plan, or be added at designated locations. A checklist is also enclosed to identify the response location.

If you have any questions, or need any further information, please let me know.

Respectfully,

Dan W. Guy

Dan W. Guy
Mgr. Permitting/Compliance

cc: Johnny Coffey
File

Tom — 12/6

Check for completeness
then write me a memo.
Continue to work on TD
and TA. (Would like done
by 12/22, if possible).

Thanks.

Pam

TECHNICAL DEFICIENCIES
TRAIL MOUNTAIN #9 MINE
ACT/015/009

Beaver Creek Coal Company
Emery County, Utah
January 19, 1990

UMC 800 Bonding-(PGL)

Bond Updated - 1988. No changes requiring bond adjustment since then

The reclamation bond estimate must be updated to incorporate all changes to be consistent with the reclamation plan.

UMC 817.11 Signs and Markers-(PGL)

Sec. 3.3.5; p. 3-22

The applicant must state the duration of time that signs will be maintained at the Trail Mountain #9 Mine for inclusion in the PAP (page 3-22).

UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements-(HS)

The final reclamation plan is partially contingent upon the conclusions drawn from data obtained from the revegetation test plots (i.e., introduced vs. native seed mixtures). Additionally, the test plots were designed to demonstrate the suitability of existing fill material (proposed substitute topsoil) as a plant growth medium for final reclamation.

The applicant's plan to regrade, topsoil, revegetate, and provide erosion control, etc., is inadequate and contradictory. Reclamation commitments within the PAP (Chapters III and VIII) do not reflect commitments and reclamation procedures elucidated in Appendix 9-1 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting). Although conclusions regarding reclamation feasibility and site specific revegetation techniques are partially dependent upon the results from the revegetation test plots, general reclamation procedures should be predictable at this time. Therefore, the operator must submit for Division review, a revised version of the reclamation plan which reflects preliminary test plot results, original reclamation plan (i.e., Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting), Division memo (i.e., Dan Duce, Reclamation Soils Specialist, dated February 24, 1988), existing PAP text, and etc. 2/15/90

The applicant states "if future disturbance uncovers or encounters salvagable soil, Beaver Creek Coal Company will remove, stockpile, and stabilize soil (pages 3-52 and 3-57)." This statement must include verbage which commits to analyzing said materials prior to removal (UMC 817.21[a]) and in accordance with Division Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 1. Sec. 3.5.2, p. 3-52; Sec. 3.5.4.3, p. 3-57.

UMC 817.22 Topsoil: Removal-(HS)

2/15/90

Revegetation test plot data indicates relatively successful revegetation. Continued monitoring (i.e., fifth year, ninth year, and tenth year) of the plots may reveal vegetation sustainability and reference area compatibility. As a reminder, the applicant is required to submit test plot vegetation surveys conducted in the summer of 1989. These results must be submitted in the Annual Report (April 1990).

Review of the soils data collected in 1987 indicate the following:

1. Surficial salt activity (Electrical Conductivity-E.C.) is lower than salt activity in the lower profile.

2. Field inspections of the test plot soil and the existing fill material indicates lower bulk density within the test plot soils.

3. A soil moisture deficit exists during the majority of the growing season (i.e., high evapotranspiration potential: low effective precipitation).

Preliminary Conclusions: Salt is being leached down through the profile or salt activity in the lower profile has not had adequate time to migrate up through the profile. Since both hypotheses are feasible, continued analyses of the salt activity (E.C.) at various depths within the profile is required.

Hence, E.C. must be analyzed at various depths throughout the test plot soil profile in the spring (late May/early June) and fall (mid-Septembere) of 1994.

UMC 817.24 Topsoil: Redistribution-(HS)

(Refer to comments under UMC 817.21 Topsoil: General Requirements).

2/15/9

The applicant must state the manner in which the stockpiled topsoil will be redistributed (i.e., veneer the surface of regraded soils/spoils, redistribute upon areas where the material was derived, etc.).

Sec. 3.5.4.1, p 3-57.

The applicant states (page 8-10, Section 3.5.4.1 and page 3-57) "Upon abandonment the postmining land use will not require extensive backfilling and grading." Accordingly, many areas which remain unaltered by backfilling and grading operations as well as those areas which incur intense machinery traffic will be highly compacted. The applicant must commit to deep ripping regraded spoil/soils and disking topsoil if surface compaction is high. Please specify the approximate depth of deep ripping and disking.

UMC 817.25 Topsoil: Nutrients and Amendments-(HS)

The applicant must state how the need for fertilizer and/or soil amendments will be determined (i.e., sampling program, constituent to be analyzed). p. 3-2

UMC 817.41 Hydrologic Balance: General Requirements-(TM)

Appendix 7-1; Appendix 7-2.

The applicant needs to update the water quality plans and data submitted in the PAP into a cohesive updated section, providing a data summary or reference to an annual report. This section must provide a table listing all water monitoring sites and monitoring frequencies.

The elimination of data sheets and figures other than updated materials is necessary to condense the PAP. Figure 7-9 needs to be updated to reflect current references to appendices in the PAP and show all monitoring locations including 26-4P.

UMC 817.42 Hydrologic Balance: Water Quality Standards and Effluent Limitations-(TM)

Sec. 7.2.4.2. Fig. 3-16, 7-11.

The applicant has not provided enough detail regarding site plans for erosion and sediment control methodologies that will be employed during active mining and reclamation. The applicant must provide a site plan which will provide the necessary details to show what Best Technology Currently Available (BCTA) will be used to treat all affected areas, both during active operations and mining.

Sec. 7.2.4. p. 7-5 Fig. 3-1

Tables in the PAP must summarize the areas to be treated by BTCA for both the current operations and reclamation of the site. The information in the table will delineate drainage area size and treatment methodology for all permitted areas which will not report directly to a sediment pond. The table in the PAP will include an area number from a figure or plate which identifies the area and treatment. The term "small area exemption" does not apply unless the area is revegetated and released from bonding requirements.

2/15/90

It is prudent that the applicant consider leaving a sediment pond in place following reclamation, or a modified version of the current pond to alleviate concerns regarding sediment control during reclamation.

2/15/90

The applicant must organize the plan in a manner which allows the reader to refer to calculations referenced by an explanation in the text. References generally were not correct, and as a general comment, the whole reclamation plan is very disorganized, although basic information is available and scattered throughout appendices in the PAP.

2/15/90

The applicant needs to reorganize the reclamation plan into a cohesive section and modify the plan to provide the necessary details.

UMC 817.43 Diversions-(TM)

Sec. 7.2.9.2, p. 7-
Figure 7-11; App 7

The applicant must supply information regarding the design capacity of the 66-inch bypass culvert for Cottonwood Creek. Specifically, four additional inlets along the County Road tie into the bypass system. The applicant must show how these drainage areas are considered in the design calculations (inlet above lower gate adjacent to fence, two inlets across from main gate on west side of road, and one inlet just north of the 96-inch culvert inlet).

Fig. 7-1
Table 7-8,
p. 7-53,
Sec. 7.2.4.
p. 7-52.

Drawings must be updated to reflect two additional drainages into the sedimentation pond (a total of three inlets to the pond). A fourth inlet has been identified as the mine water discharge pipe, and also needs to be shown. An additional undisturbed ditch draining into the sediment pond from a small disturbed area identified in the field as draining a 25 foot x 15 foot area needs to be shown on a map and sized in the PAP.

UMC 817.44 Stream Channel Diversions-(TM)

2/15/90

The operator presents reclamation plans for both the main channel of Cottonwood Creek and the side canyon draining into Cottonwood Creek. The calculations and plans for both of these drainages calls for installation of check dams and riprap sized by riprap nomographs. The applicant has presented some questionable designs regarding no riprap placement in the channel bottoms. This design parameter is not acceptable to the Division.

2/15/9

No sediment control for channel reconstruction has been recommended because the applicant considers it not practical. The Division feels that the installation of check dams will provide temporary sediment control until the channel has stabilized following construction. A detailed explanation of how these check dams will be installed is necessary to complete the PAP and an explanation of how they will provide sediment control is required.

UMC 817.48 Hydrologic Balance: Acid- and Toxic-Forming Materials-(HS)

Sec. 3.4.9,
p. 3-48.

The applicant states in Appendix 9, page 16 through 17B that "during grading, cut and fill operations, unsuitable materials will be buried with four feet of material." The applicant must state how unsuitable material (i.e., Oil and Grease, Selenium, Acid-Forming Potential, etc.) will be identified, and what sampling and laboratory methods will be employed to determine suitability.

Sec. 3.4.
p. 3-48

The applicant must commit to sample and analyze sediment pond waste material prior to removal. Samples must be analyzed in accordance with the Division's Guidelines for Management of Topsoil and Overburden, Table 6. Please incorporate similar verbage in appropriate sections of the PAP.

Sec. 3.4.9, p. 3-48.

All excess soil, sediment pond waste, etc., temporarily disposed of on the surface, must be bermed and analyzed for its acid- and/or toxic-forming potential if stored on the surface for more than seven calendar days. Please make necessary PAP text changes.

UMC 817.71 Disposal of Excess Spoil and Underground Development Waste: General Requirements-(HS)

Sec. 3.3.5.3, p. 3-24; Sec. 3.4.9, p. 3-48.

References regarding refuse disposal in an approved landfill (page 3-24 and 3-48) are unacceptable (UMC 817.71[a]). All such verbage must be deleted from the PAP.

UMC 817.89 Disposal of Noncoal Wastes-(PGL)

Sec. 3.4.9, p 3-48.

The applicant must update the disposal of noncoal waste at this mine site (page 3-48) for inclusion in the PAP.

UMC 817.113 Revegetation: Timing-(HS)

Sec. 3.5.5, p. 3-57A.

Seeding and planting of disturbed areas must be conducted during the first normal period for favorable planting conditions and after final site preparation. Please incorporate such language on page 3-57 of the PAP.

Appendix 9-1, pp 10A-10B.

If a land imprinter is utilized, seed must be broadcast immediately before imprinting. Additionally, the land imprinter is most effective when the seedbed is light textured or loose from disking or plowing. The applicant must incorporate such language into the PAP and insure that the land imprinter actually imprints the surface of the soil/spoil as designed.

UMC 817.114 Revegetation: Mulching and Other Soil Stabilizing Practices-(HS)

2/15/90

The applicant indicates that surface erosion control will be provided, utilizing erosion control matting or wood fiber mulch (page 3-51). In Appendix 9-1, page 14 (Mt. Nebo Scientific Research and Consulting Report), the applicant commits to cover the entire reclaimed area with erosion control matting. It should be noted that given the final slope configurations, the proximity to a perennial fishery stream and the high silt and clay fraction within the proposed substitute topsoil, erosion control matting should cover the entire reclaimed site. Additionally, it is imperative that erosion control matting be installed in strict accordance with manufacturer's specifications. Please incorporate this information into the PAP.

djh
AT107/8-12

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

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

October 19, 1989

Dear

Re: **Updated Text, Five-Year Permit Renewal, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Trail Mountain #9 Mine, ACT/015/009, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah**

Enclosed for your review is one copy of the updated text attendant to the Trail Mountain #9 Mine Five-Year Permit Renewal.

The Division anticipates completing this permitting action by February 21, 1990. Accordingly, should your office wish to provide the Division comments, please do so by December 21, 1989.

Sincerely,

Richard V. Smith

Richard V. Smith
Permit Supervisor

djh
Enclosure
cc: J. Helfrich, DOGM
AT64/119

Mr. Peter A. Rutledge, Chief
Division of Federal Programs
Western Field Operations
Office of Surface Mining
Brooks Towers, 1020 15th Street
Denver, Colorado 80202 Mr. Rutledge:

Mr. Robert Hagen, Director
Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement
Albuquerque Field Office
Suite 310, Silver Square
625 Silver Avenue, S. W.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102Mr. Hagen:

Mr. Jim Dryden, Area Manager
Bureau of Land Management
San Rafael Resource Area
900 North 700 East
Price, Utah 84501Mr. Dryden:

Mr. Clark Johnson
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services
Ecological Services
2060 Administration Building
1745 West 1700 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104-5110Mr. Johnson:

Mr. George Morris
Forest Supervisor
U.S. Forest Service
Manti-LaSal National Forest
599 West Price River Road
Price, Utah 84501Mr. Morris:

Mr. Dale Parker, Assistant Director
Utah Department of Health
Division of Environmental Health
P. O. Box 16700
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116-0700Mr. Parker:

Mr. Timothy H. Provan, Director
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
1596 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116Mr. Provan:

Mr. Robert Morgan, State Engineer
Utah Division of Water Rights
Utah Department of Natural Resources
1636 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116Mr. Morgan:

Mr. Max J. Evans, Director
Utah Division of State History
300 Rio Grande
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101Mr. Evans:

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

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

January 18, 1990

Mr. George Morris
Forest Supervisor
U.S. Forest Service
Manti-LaSal National Forest
599 West Price River Road
Price, Utah 84501

Dear Mr. Morris:

RE: **Updated Text, Five-Year Permit Renewal, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Trail Mountain #9 Mine, ACT/015/009, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah**

Enclosed for your review is a copy of the updated text (dated October 19, 1989 and November 30, 1989) attendant to the Trail Mountain #9 Mine Five-Year Permit Renewal. The plates that accompanied these submittals are Plates 3-1, 4-2, 7-11, and 10-3.

The Division anticipates completing this permitting action by February 21, 1990. Accordingly, should you wish to provide the Division with comments, please do so by January 31, 1990.

Sincerely,

Pamela Grubaugh-Littig
Permit Supervisor

djh
Enclosure
AT45/137

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

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

January 19, 1990

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

Dear Mr. Guy:

Re: **Technical Deficiency Items, Five-Year Permit Renewal Application, Beaver Creek Coal Company, Trail Mountain #9 Mine, ACT/015/009, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah**

Enclosed is the Technical Deficiency document for the Trail Mountain #9 Mine. The reclamation plan needs to be reorganized into a cohesive section and all of the necessary details included.

Please address these items by January 31, 1990. The technical analysis written by our office must be completed by February 15, 1990.

Sincerely,

Pamela Grubaugh-Littig
Permit Supervisor

djh
Enclosure
AT45/130

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

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

UTAH DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING
FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

DATE: January 19, 1990

FAX # SENT TO: 637-1191

ATTN: DAN GUY

COMPANY: Beaver Creek Coal Company

FROM: PAM GRUBAUGH-LITTIG

DEPARTMENT: DOGM

NUMBER OF PAGES BEING SENT (INCLUDING THIS ONE): 7

If you do not receive all, or if they are illegible, please contact us at (801)538-5340.

We are sending from a Murata Facsimile Machine. Our telecopier number is (801)359-3940.

MESSAGES:

UMC 784.21 Fish and Wildlife Plan-(WJM)

p. 10-35

The applicant must submit a verification statement (Appendix 10), that power lines have not changed at the surface mine site since November 26, 1982, or if the lines have changed, documentation should be provided that raptor protection has been installed in accordance with UMC 817.97(c).

UMC 784.23 Operation Plan: Maps and Plans-(PGL)

Plate 3-1

(b)(3) The bonded area must be shown on an appropriate map.

(c) Plate 3-1, the Surface Facilities Map, must be certified. Plate 3-1

AT107/2-4
11/8/89

BEAVER CREEK Coal Company
Post Office Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501
Telephone 801 637-5050

October 17, 1989

Mr. Rick Smith
Permit Supervisor
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & mining
355 West North Temple
#3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

RE: Permit Renewal
Trail Mountain No.9 Mine
ACT/015/009
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Smith,

Beaver Creek Coal Company is hereby applying for renewal of the Mining and Reclamation Permit No. ACT/015/009 for its Trail Mountain No.9 Mine. This application is submitted in accordance with the provisions of UMC 788.13 through 788.15.

It should be noted that no major permit changes have occurred since the issuance of the original permit in February 1985, or the subsequent Mid-term review and approval in December, 1988. Minor changes and other required information are enclosed, in accordance with the following listed provisions of UMC 788.14:

(a) Contents: Updated copies of all revisions or amendments to the plan have recently been submitted for inclusion in the M.R.P. There are no outstanding amendments; therefore, existing plans should be complete and updated with the addition of the enclosed information;

(1) The name and address of the permittee is shown in Section 2.2.1 (p.2-1) of the M.R.P.; The permit number is ACT/015/009, as shown in Appendix 2-5 of the M.R.P. The requested term of permit renewal is 5 years, as described in Section 2.6 (p2-11) of the original approved permit - minor changes or amendments have been placed into the permit on an on-going, as-approved basis.

(2) A proposed new Public Notice for Permit Renewal is attached to this application - this is a new Appendix (2-7), and should be added to the M.R.P. in the Chapter 2 Appendices Section.

(3) An insurance liability policy is shown as Appendix 2-3 of the M.R.P.

(b) Processing and Review

(1) Public notice will be filed in accordance with UMC 786.11(a) - see attached Appendix 2-7;

(2) This application for renewal does not extend beyond the boundaries of the existing, approved permit;

(3) N/A - no new land areas are included with this application;

(4) There have been no modifications or amendments to the permit that have required any change in the existing performance bond for the property; (See Appendix 2-4).

Also enclosed with the application are copies of the most recent monitoring results.

The results of water monitoring should be added to Appendix 7-2. The results of the vegetation monitoring should be added to Appendix 9-2, and the subsidence monitoring report should be added to Appendix 12-4.

Ownership information, as shown in Chapter 2 of the M.R.P., is up-to-date; however, an updated Compliance History is enclosed and should replace the existing Appendix 2-2. A $5.00 filing fee is also enclosed with the application.

Three (3) copies each of the above listed items are enclosed with this submittal. Additional copies will be sent at your request.

It is our hope this application will meet with your approval. If you have any questions or need any further information, please let me know.

Respectfully,

Dan W. Guy

Dan W. Guy
Mgr. Permitting/Compliance

cc: R.D. Pick, without enclosures
J.L. Coffey " "
B.H. Biersdorf " "