

0023



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

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

April 25, 1986

Mr. Randy B. Gainer
Project Manager
Earth Fax Engineering Inc.
6542 South 670 West
Murray, Utah 84123

Dear Mr. Gainer:

Re: Initial Draft Report, SOAP contract, Boyer Mine, ACT/043/008,
Summit County, Utah

The Division has received and reviewed your Initial Draft Report on the Boyer Coal Mine, ACT/043/008, submitted to fulfill the requirements of the SOAP contract number 587504. Please find enclosed the memo to Technical File which summarizes the review and our meeting of April 11, 1986.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rick Summers'.

Rick Summers
Reclamation Hydrologist

jvb
Enclosure
cc: Lowell P. Braxton
Sue Linner
6000R-8

April 23, 1986

TO: Technical File
FROM: Rick P. Summers, Reclamation Hydrologist *RS*
RE: Initial Draft Report, Boyer Coal Mine, SOAP contract,
ACT/043/008, Summit Co., Utah.

Summary

Earthfax Engineering, Inc. submitted the Initial Draft Report required by the SOAP contract (requisition number 587504) on March 4, 1986. The report was reviewed against the requirements of the above referenced contract dated May 1985. Page 21 of the contractual agreement states, "A draft report compiled in the format designated in D.1 "Task Description" (any order is acceptable) must be submitted to the OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE within 240 days of receipt of the effective date of contract. Results and conclusions do not have to be submitted at this time as data collection may not be complete enough to make adequate conclusions". The review indicated that the majority of the contracted items had not been addressed at this time.

The intent of the required initial draft report was to insure that the consultant was conducting an adequate investigation to insure a complete and adequate final report upon contract completion. Based upon the lack of information included in this report, a determination of adequacy of work performance by the consultant could not be made. Concern about the possibility of missing the spring runoff season and extending the contract another year has been raised.

A meeting with Randy Gainer and Richard White of Earthfax Engineering was held at the Division offices on April 11, 1986 to express our concerns and discuss the progress of the project. The consultants assured us that work was progressing on schedule and in fact, many of the items not addressed in the report are actually included in the monthly submittals. We responded that in our opinion, the draft final report should include all items that could be completed to date and subsequently the final report would only need the inclusion of the final data collected. The report is not considered adequate at this time to meet the contract agreement.

Page 2
Technical Memo
ACT/043/008
April 23, 1986

Recommendations

In lieu of the fact that a final draft report is scheduled to be submitted on May 24, 1986, we felt it would be unnecessary to require another submission of the initial draft report. I feel the consultant is making a diligent effort to insure a complete and adequate final report for submission on that date. In my opinion, the report due on May 24, 1986 should be considered both the initial draft and final draft phases of the report preparation. If the report is inadequate at this time, that report should be considered the initial draft report and the contract will be delinquent by one report.

Body

The contractual agreement, Exhibit D, (May 1985) states "The owner will review the document for technical and physical deficiencies and return the report to the CONSULTANT within 30 days accompanied by a detailed critique of inadequacies". In light of the overall deficiency of the report, a detailed review could not be conducted at this time. Rather, to fulfill the obligations of the OWNER in the contract, a copy of the contractual agreement is attached with the notation in the left hand margin as to whether or not the item was addressed in the report. NA is used to indicate the item is not addressed or only partially addressed. No notation indicates the item is either addressed (although this should not be construed as being reviewed and determined adequate) or the item could not be completed at this stage of the report development (i.e. data collection not complete, or final analysis requires complete a data set).

cc: Lowell P. Braxton
Sue Linner
Dave Cline
6000R-3