



United States Department of the Interior  
 OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING  
 Reclamation and Enforcement  
 BROOKS TOWERS  
 1020 15TH STREET  
 DENVER, COLORADO 80202

File ACT/015/017  
 ACT/015/018-A  
 ACT/015/018-B  
 w/appropriate  
 attachment  
 Copy w/attach.  
 to appropriate  
 individuals.

7 OCT 1981

RECEIVED  
 OCT 13 1981  
 DIVISION OF  
 OIL, GAS & MINING

JIM  
 OCT 14 1981

Mr. James W. Smith, Jr.  
 Coordinator of Mined Land Development  
 Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining  
 1588 West North Temple  
 Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Dear Jim:

At your request, my staff has performed an Apparent Completeness Review (ACR) on Utah Power and Light's (UP&L) underground mines in Utah. These mines include the Deseret-Beehive-Little Dove (Des-Bee-Dove) Mine Complex, the Wilberg Mine, and the Deer Creek Mine. Based upon OSM's staff review (See Attachment I, II and III), I find the mining and reclamation plans to be incomplete and technically deficient. Since the three plans used much of the same information, the deficiencies in the three separate plans are similar to each other.

Comment by the Manti LaSal National Forest and the U.S. Geological Survey are attached to the respective apparent completeness reviews.

Mr. Robert Yuhnke of the Environmental Defense Fund has requested a copy of the ACR for the Wilberg Mine when the review is complete. Since your Division has final review of the product, I request that you honor this request.

If you have any questions in regard to this review, please contact Shirley Lindsay of my staff.

Sincerely,

*Richard H. Schueneman for*  
 Richard Dawes  
 Acting Deputy Administrator  
 Western Technical Center

Attachments

cc: Jackson Moffitt (w/attachments)  
 Reed Christensen (w/attachments)

File ACT/015/017  
Copy to G.H.

Deseret-Beehive - Little Dove Mining and Reclamation Plan  
Utah Power and Light, Emery County, Utah

Apparent Completeness Review

JIM  
OCT 14 1981

UMC/782.13

Identification of Interests

Figure 1-1 (Coal Ownership Map) identifies coal lease boundaries as well as the applicant's permit area boundary. Since all mines operated by the applicant (i.e. Wilberg, Deer Creek, and Des-Bee-Dove) are located on one map, if it is impossible to locate the permit area for any one mine. The applicant should submit a map that locates the permit area for the Desert-Beehive-Little Dove Mines.

The applicant should discuss the current status of the exchange of PRLA's in Garfield County.

782.14

Compliance Information

No Comment.

782.15

Right of Entry and Operation Information

The applicant lists (pp 1-5/6) the federal and private coal leases for operations at the Des-Bee-Dove Mines and states that the (leases have all been subleased or assigned to UP&L. The applicant should provide a description of the documents conveying the right of entry to UP&L.

782.16

Relationship to Areas Designated Unsuitable for Mining

No Comment.

782.17

Permit Term Information

The application contains several tables (Tables 1 through 5, p. 3-6) and maps (Maps 3-1 and 3-2) showing each phase of mining through 1991. This information is useful in understanding the total mining and reclamation plan; however, it must be pointed out at this time that unless the applicant specifically requests and justifies a longer permit term, it is assumed that the permit will be for five years.

782.18

Personal Injury and Property Damage  
Insurance Information

On page 1-21, the applicant describes that the insurance coverage will be maintained in full force and effect during the life of the permit or any renewal thereof. The applicant needs to: 1) include rider that the insurance company will notify OSM and Utah DOGM if substantial changes are made to the policy and 2) confirm that the applicant will keep insurance in effect through completion of reclamation operation.

782.19 Identification of Other Licenses and Permits

No Comment.

782.21 Identification of location of Public Office for Filing of application

No Comment.

782.21 Newspaper Advertisement and Proof of Publication

The applicant states (p. 1-13) that proof of publication will be filed within four weeks after the date of publication. Our records does not contain such a submittal.

783.12 General Environmental Resources Information

(See Cultural Resources).

783.13 Description of Hydrology and Geology: General Requirements

No Comment.

783.14 Geology Description

No Comment.

783.15 Ground Water Information

No Comment.

783.16 Surface Water Information

It is requested that the applicant provide an estimate of sediment yield in order for the regulatory authority to determine postmining impacts. This estimate can be obtained from the sediment volume accumulation in the existing sedimentation pond.

783.17 Alternative Water Supply

The applicant proposes (p. 2-88) to divert water from adjacent springs into areas where other springs may have stopped flowing. The applicant must demonstrate the ownership of sufficient water rights to accomplish this diversion.

783.18 Climatological Information

No Comment.

783.19

Vegetation Information

The baseline survey is inadequate and incomplete. The following areas are inadequate: the cover sampling method used (i.e. step-point transect) and the reference area size (UP&L proposes reference areas of 1/2 and 3/4 acres. The recommended reference area size is a minimum of two acres). The following information must be provided by the applicant: 1) species cover estimates; 2) threatened and endangered plant species survey methods; 3) production sampling procedures to be employed at the time of bond release testing; 4) shrub density methods and/or data; and 5) reference area range condition.

783.22

Land Use Information

The applicant must provide the following information: 1) range condition assessment procedures and 2) the capabilities of the land in the permit area.

783.24

Maps: General Requirements

No Comments.

783.25

Cross Sections, Maps, and Plans.

No Comments.

783.27

Prime Farmland Investigation

The regulatory agency agrees that the Des-Bee-Dove Mine site does not qualify as prime farmlands.

784.11

Operation Plan: General Requirements

No Comments.

784.12

Operation Plan: Existing Structures

No Comments.

784.13

Reclamation Plan: General Requirements

Bonding Estimate

The applicant calculates the bond using a salvage value for the tripple building (p. 4-15). No salvage value can be allowed because the regulatory authority may not have first lien on properties. The applicant must recalculate the bond with this correction.



- Backfilling and Grading & Coal Waste

1. Page 2 of Appendix X indicates that the applicant may intend to continue dumping of coal wastes at the present location and continue down the canyon. However, the downstream face has been covered with earth materials as if in a final configuration. Please clarify.

2. The reclamation plan for the facilities area utilizes a riprapped channel for conveyance of surface flows across the coal waste embankment (presently the storage yard). However, UMC 817.83(b) requires that surface water runoff from the area above the fill shall be diverted away from the fill and into stabilized diversion channels. Applicant will therefore not be in compliance and must either modify the water conveyance proposal or apply for a variance.

784.17 Protection of Public Parks and Historic Places

No Comment.

784.18 Relocation or Use of Public Roads

The applicant request (p. 4-21) an exemption from further public review concerning surface mining operations within 100 feet of a public road. The request is based upon the applicability of 761.11(a)(4)(i). There is no such regulation. Please clarify.

784.19 Underground Development Waste

The applicant proposes to transport waste to a site near the Wilberg Mine. This request will be dealt with separately.

784.20 Subsidence Control Plan

The applicant has an existing subsidence monitoring including two studies being performed in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines (p. 4-24). It would be helpful in evaluating the impacts of subsidence if the applicant submitted the results of these studies to the regulatory agencies. Adequacy of the plan will be addressed in the technical analysis.

784.22 Stream Channel Diversions

No Comments.

784.23 Operation Plan: Maps and Plans

The applicant should provide a map locating all subsidence monitoring points.

784.24

Transportation Facilities

1. The applicant has not addressed the road to the pump house facility from the main access road. This road must be described in a manner similar to that provided for other transportation facilities.
2. The road cross-sections of Map 3-5 have no horizontal scale. This must be provided.
3. On p. 3-33 of the mine plan, it is stated that the portal access road averages 20 ft. in width. Map 3-4, sheet 1, shows a typical cross-section of this same road, but with a width of 14 ft. Please clarify.
4. No evidence has been presented which indicates that the drainage ditches and culverts are adequate to pass the peak flow from the 10-year, 24-hour precipitation event. Design calculations must be provided for these features.

784.25 Return of Coal Processing Waste to Abandoned Underground Workings

The applicant has not proposed to return coal processing wastes underground.

784.26

Air Pollution Control Plan

The applicant should supply quantitative estimates of the emissions (Fugitive dust) from each source on the site. From these estimates the applicant should describe adequate control measures to be applied to each source and provide quantitative estimates of their effectiveness (p. 3-39 Air Pollution Control Plan).

The applicant should also include copies of any emissions permits (or their applications) which have been issued by the Utah Department of Health for this mine. Also, the applicant should state whether or not an emissions monitoring program is planned for the site and explain the reasoning behind any decision made to conduct or not to conduct a program.

Cultural Resources

The cultural resources submission is the same for the Des-Bee-Dove, Deer Creek and Wilberg complex of mines all owned by the Utah Power and Light Company. As such, they were reviewed together as if they were a single submission. The basic document under consideration is entitled "Archaeological Sample Survey and Cultural Resource Evaluations of the East Mountain Locality in Emery County, Utah" prepared by Hauck and Weder, 1980.

Considerations

1. Since the three separate, though adjacent, mines are covered by a single report, a short summary introductory section concerning cultural resources, explaining the relationships of the three mines and what was specifically found in each, should be included in each mine plan.

Project boundaries and separation of the various mines should be added to Figures 2 and 6 for clarity. Additionally, the northern areas of the Deer Creek Mine are not shown on Figure 6.

2. How were the various sample sizes and locations chosen? Were the eight earlier 160-acre sample areas considered in the sampling procedure?
3. A number of historic mines (Johnson, Anderson, Huntington) are located near the project boundaries; if they fall within or will be impacted by (directly or indirectly) mining operations, they will need to be recorded and then eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places determined.
4. Is the definition on pp. 2-38 of the Des-Bee-Dove submission the minimal site definition? If not, what is? How is an isolated find defined?
5. The following site forms are needed for evaluative purposes: 42EM1307, 1308, 1309, 1310, 853, 854, 855. A discussion of survey, recording and collection techniques and methodologies utilized is needed. Brief site descriptions to complement the site forms are needed. Eligibility recommendations are needed for the seven sites. The cultural resource rating system is no longer utilized. Those sites rated 2 and 3 are likely eligible for nomination to the National Register.

Additional information requested by the Office of Surface Mining to comply with the performance standards of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

#### Socioeconomics

Although the mine is an existing operation, the following information would be useful:

1. Number of mining employees (construction, if any, and operation) by year for the life of the mine. Also, average annual salary information would be useful.
2. Any information you may have concerning where existing and/or future employees may reside and their mode of transport to work i.e., carpool, private auto, busing program etc.
3. Any data the company can provide concerning tax revenues contributed to the local municipalities.

It also would be helpful if the company would provide OSM with documentation of any past and/or future contributions or assistance given to communities surrounding the mine (e.g., financial contributions, employee transportation system, housing assistance to employees, etc.).

817.22 Soil Resource Information

On p. 2-103 of the environmental resources, the furnace slag analysis indicated a high pH of 10.9. If the volume of this furnace slag is considerably smaller than the suitable plant growth material it is to be mixed with, the effect of the high pH will be minimal. However, should the furnace

slag and suitable plant growth material volumes differentiate little, the high pH could prove detrimental to plant development. The applicant should explain in more detail the methodology used in handling the furnace slag or demonstrate that the high pH will not prove to be detrimental to plant growth.

The applicant needs to identify the column immediately to the right of the texture column for the data results on samples received June 30, 1980.

On p. 2-101 of the environmental resources, the applicant states: "The parking lots and storage areas may have places where undesirable conditions for plant growth have developed; these areas must be covered with suitable growth media before revegetation can be successful." It is suggested that the applicant provide information on where the suitable growth media will be obtained.

817.97 Protection of Fish, Wildlife, and Related Environmental Values

Does the regulatory authority or the Fish and Wildlife Service concur that transmission line design is "eagle-safe"?

The Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) mitigation plan is included in the application (pp. 2-115 through 2-125) without comment. Has the applicant incorporated all those elements of the DWR plan that they intend to utilize in the application?