



0005  
STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Oil, Gas & Mining

pro/043/001+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

FILE COPY  
August 11, 1987

TO: File  
FROM: Rick P. Summers, Reclamation Hydrologist  
RE: Reply to Response to Stipulations, Dated August 8, 1987,  
Summit No. 1 Coal Mine, Reclamation Plan, PRO/043/001,  
Summit County, Utah.

#### Summary

The applicant's response to our state Decision Package stipulations (received August 10, 1987) was reviewed for hydrology concerns (UMC 817.42-2 and 817.46-2). The following memo further substantiates the review team's position on these matters.

#### Body

##### UMC 817.42-2-RS

The intent of this stipulation was not to reclaim the existing sedimentation pond, rather it was to insure that sedimentation control structures be placed between Chalk Creek and the reclaimed area during the reclamation period. The Division agrees that the existing sediment pond should remain.

##### UMC 817.46-2-RS

The Division has evaluated the expected sediment yield using USLE and feels our results are justifiable and realistic. Apparently, two discrepancies exist between the applicant's submitted values and the values used in the technical analysis. First, the value used for K appears to be underestimated. The Division used a value of appx. 0.24 based upon the soils analysis report from USU provided in the permit application. Samples nos. 5 thru 8 indicate the soils in the area are predominantly loam with some sandy loam. Referring to Table 5.6 (enclosed) the recommended values range from 0.37 to 0.42. However, Table 5.5 (enclosed) indicates a value of 0.24 for fine sandy loam to sandy loam soils. Considering the local values given by Mr. Tim Watson (see HE-6 of the MRP) for our decision, it was decided to use the lower of the two referenced values (0.25).

Page 3  
Lowell Braxton  
September 24, 1987

It is to be recognized that this level of education is comparable to University level work. However, this training is only available through the NEC. It is proposed that the State cover the cost of tuition and travel for the first two courses, not to exceed \$1000.00. I would provide personal funding for the remainder of the program (estimated at \$1700.00). This level of funding is not excessively large compared to my past training costs (i.e. Rock Drain course in B.C. was appx. \$750.00).

It must be noted that the reason for such an early request for the program is due to limited availability for the courses. All IF 200 courses (prerequisite to continuing the program) have 25% of the openings reserved for Federal FWS personnel.

It is my hope that the proposal will be evaluated favorably. I am open to modifications in the proposal. I have no trouble signing any required reimbursement contracts with the Department concerning this program and the longevity of my employment duration. Thanks for your time on this matter.

cc: Sue Linner

6000R-67