

0023

file ACT/OIS/OIS #3  
cc T. Munson  
R. Smith



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

JUN 11 1986

Mr. Lowell P. Braxton, Administrator  
Mineral Resource Development and Reclamation Program  
Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining  
355 West North Temple  
3 Triad Center, Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

Dear Mr. Braxton:

Enclosed are the U.S. Forest Service comments on the proposed changes to the spring and seep monitoring plan for the Deer Creek mine. These need to be addressed in order for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement to concur with the proposed change.

If you have any questions, please call Rick Lawton or Richard Holbrook at (303) 844-2896.

Sincerely,

Melvin L. Shilling, Chief  
Mining Analysis Division

Enclosure

RECEIVED  
JUN 19 1986

DIVISION OF  
OIL, GAS & MINING

RECEIVED  
JUN 13 1986

DIVISION OF  
OIL, GAS & MINING

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Manti-LaSal  
National Forest

599 West Price River Dr.  
Price, Utah 84501

1986 JUN -1 9 5

WESTERN TECHNICAL CENTER

Reply to: 2820

Date: May 28, 1986

Rick Lawton  
OSM - Reclamation and Enforcement  
Brooks Towers  
1020 15th Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202

Dear Mr. Lawton:

The Forest Service has reviewed the proposal by Utah Power and Light Company to eliminate certain springs from their monitoring program as a permanent change. We do not concur with the permanent elimination of springs 79-25, 79-30, 79-31, 79-32, and 79-33 from the current monitoring program. Since the springs are situated within an area that is not scheduled to be mined during the next ten years, the monitoring of the springs can be temporarily postponed, except for 79-32. This spring should be kept in the study recession group. Monitoring of the other four springs must again commence at least three years prior to the area being mined. This would provide approximately seven years relief between monitoring periods for the four springs.

Utah Power and Light Company also indicates that eliminating the five springs would reduce their monitoring number by seven. Is this a number mistake or have two more springs been proposed to be dropped from monitoring?

There has not been enough information provided to justify the deletion of spring 79-32 from the current monitoring program and add spring 79-29 to it. Spring 79-32 is located at the contact of the KPR and TKn, while spring 79-29 is in the middle of TKn. What flow characteristics are similar between the two springs? Additional justification will have to be provided and evaluated prior to a decision being made.

If there are any questions, please contact us.

Sincerely,

*W. H. Bably*

for  
REED C. CHRISTENSEN  
Forest Supervisor