



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

015/018#2
Norman H. Bangerter, Governor
Dee C. Hansen, Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

December 28, 1987

Mr. Ray Christensen, Manager
Utah Power and Light Company
Permitting and Compliance
Mining Division
P. O. Box 310
Huntington, Utah 84528

Draft

Dear Mr. Christensen:

Re: UMC 783.20 Fish and Wildlife Resources, Information for Proposed Waste Rock Disposal Site, Utah Power and Light Company, Deer Creek Mine, ACT/015/018, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah

You telephoned John Whitehead more than a week ago, asking what wildlife studies and level of detail were needed for permitting the Deer Creek Mine waste rock disposal site (T.17S, R.8E S.6NE), pursuant to UMC 783.20.

I consulted with Clark Johnson of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) who believes site-specific wildlife studies are unnecessary. The USFWS is more interested in effective, wildlife-oriented reclamation. Specifically, Mr. Johnson expressed concern that (1) the site be adequately reclaimed; (2) reclamation include shrubs and forbs beneficial to wildlife; and (3) the reclaimed surface be contoured to provide topographic variation for micro-habitat development.

I was unable to reach Larry Dalton of the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) as he is on annual leave until January 4, 1988. However, he expressed UDWR's concerns during our November 20, 1987 visit to the site. These concerns involved mitigation for the loss of big game winter range.

Two impact-mitigation options were suggested. The first involved chaining and re-seeding nearby tracts at five-year intervals over the life of the disposal site. The second called for the lowering of an existing fence around a pasture (above the disposal site) managed by the Utah Power and Light Farm Research Division. Modification was to meet 42-inch range fence standards.

Page 2
Ray Christensen
ACT/015/018
December 28, 1987

Craft

The Division finds that no site-specific wildlife studies are necessary, as published wildlife information is available for determination of impacts. The permit application shall nonetheless include existing wildlife resource information. Previously published data may be summarized and referenced. Attention should be given to the site's classification as big game winter habitat, which justifies habitat enhancement/impact mitigation measures proposed by UDWR. The concerns of federal and state wildlife management agencies must be addressed, as these relate to performance standards compliance.

Sincerely,

Brent A Stettler

Brent A. Stettler
Reclamation Biologist

djh
cc: C. Johnson
L. Dalton
J. Whitehead
1369R/13