

0014



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

July 6, 1988

David Smaldone, Director
Permitting & Compliance Services
41 North Redwood Road
Salt Lake City, Utah 84140

Dear Mr. Smaldone:

RE: Review of UP&L 1987 Vegetation Monitoring Report for the Deer Creek Mine, ACT/015/018, Des Bee Dove Mine, ACT/015/017, and Cottonwood Wilberg Mine, ACT/015/019, Folder #6, Emery County, Utah

Attached is a technical memorandum compiled by Brent Stettler, Reclamation Biologist, that provides some valuable feedback and assessment of the 1987 vegetation monitoring performed by UP&L.

Please assure that appropriate changes are made in the 1988 monitoring program as noted in the attached memo.

Feel free to contact Brent directly if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John J. Whitehead".

John J. Whitehead
Permit Supervisor

JJW/as
Attachment
cc: Val Payne
Brent Stettler
0028R/81



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangert
Governor

Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

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

July 5, 1988

TO: John J. Whitehead, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Brent Stettler, Reclamation Specialist *Brent*

RE: 1987 Vegetation Monitoring Report for Utah Power and Light Company's Deer Creek Mine, ACT/015/018; Des Bee Dove Mine, ACT/015/017; and Cottonwood/Wilberg Mine, ACT/015/019; Folder #6, Emery County, Utah

In general, the report was thorough and provided the necessary information. A few minor problems were evident however.

The method used to sample vegetative cover (modified pin frame), was not the method named in the permits (line intercept). Although pin frame sampling would be acceptable, the method identified by the permits should be used.

"Vegetation Information Guidelines," page 11, specify that 50 points rather than 10 constitute a single sample. This reduces sampling error. Although greater effort will be required to achieve a single sample, the number of samples needed to satisfy sample adequacy will be fewer.

A request was made to discontinue sampling of Cottonwood's old fan portal road (pp. 124-126), and reclaimed slope (pp. 134-137). For permanent reclamation the Division recommends annual qualitative observations, and quantitative sampling during years two, three, five, nine and ten.

A few errors or omissions were identified, as follow:

(1) Two desirable cover species found on Des Bee Dove's haulroad bench appear to be misidentified (page 34); neither Atriplex corrugata nor any Agropyron species was listed in the seed mix (page 32).

(2) A complete set of Vegetation Field Notes was not submitted for Cottonwood's 4th east road.

Page 2
John J. Whitehead
ACT/015/017
ACT/015/018
ACT/015/019
July 5, 1988

(3) Page 128 mistakenly compared Cottonwood's reclaimed slope and its reference area rather than Cottonwood's fan portal road and its reference area, which was intended. A comparison of the latter did not appear elsewhere in the text.

(4) Pages 43-45 were missing from the Des Bee Dove Bathhouse report.

Overall, revegetation was described as doing well, although several problem areas occurred:

(1) The vegetation on Des Bee Dove's haulroad bench consisted of 24.8% undesirable and 1.8% desirable vegetation. Poor soil conditions were suspected. Soil testing may be warranted.

(2) More than half of Cottonwood's waste rock berms and cells exhibited fair or poor revegetation establishment even after three or four years. These sites may be cause for concern.

BS/as
1369R/45-47