



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Ted Stewart
Executive Director
James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

TO: File

DATE: June 22, 1994

FROM: Jess Kelley, Reclamation Engineer JK

RE: Second Review of Tank Seam Surface Facilities Proposal,
Co-Op Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, ACT/015/025-
93B, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah

SYNOPSIS

The permittee first submitted the Tank Seam proposal for Division approval in 1993. The Division denied the first proposal. The permittee then submitted a second proposal on December 3, 1993. The Division reviewed the second proposal, found in it a number of deficiencies, and notified the permittee of those deficiencies. The permittee then corrected the deficiencies and resubmitted the proposal on May 24, 1994.

This memorandum is the result of this writer's review of the May 24 resubmittal.

ANALYSIS

This writer found six deficiencies in the December 3, 1993 submittal. All have been corrected in the May 24 submittal.

Deficiency #1 was the lack of adequate measures to prevent the movement of material from the road excavation down the slope. Pages 3H-2 through 3H-7 of the May 24 submittal correct this. These pages explain that a temporary barrier berm will be created and maintained ahead of the road excavation as it proceeds and excavation will be angled into the slope, thus assuring that excavated material will fall into the excavation and not down the slope. In addition, temporary silt fences will be installed below fill areas until erosion control matting is in place.

Deficiency #2 had to do with discrepancies between several road cross sections and the corresponding mass balance table. These discrepancies were due to a peculiarity of the computer program which the permittee used to compile the mass balance analysis and do not affect the accuracy of that analysis.



ACT/015/025
June 22, 1994
Page 2

Deficiency #3 was the absence in the blasting plan of information regarding warning and access signs. Page 3M-2 of the May 24 submittal corrects this deficiency by making provision for these signs.

Deficiency #4 was the failure of the plan to provide for topsoil redistribution on fill slopes prior to interim seeding. This deficiency was due to a misunderstanding on the writer's part. The permittee has since explained to the writer that interim seeding is to be done on subsoil and topsoil will be stockpiled and stored separately until final reclamation.

Deficiency #5 was the failure of the permittee to incorporate the results of the stability analysis into the reclamation grading plan. This has been done in the May 24 submittal. Material will be compacted in lifts which are not to exceed 18 inches in thickness. Large rocks will be stored on the Upper Storage Pad and on horizontal terraces built into the road fills, there to await their placement in the road fills during final reclamation.

Deficiency #6 was actually a caution to the permittee that the other deficiencies might affect the reclamation cost estimate and, thus, the reclamation bond. However, none of the changes made to correct the deficiencies resulted in any change in the reclamation cost estimate contained in the December 3 submittal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Tank Seam proposal, as represented by the December 3 submittal and amended by the May 24 submittal, be approved.

CC: Daron Haddock
Pamela Grubaugh-Littig