S/023/0109
cc: Wayne

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Utah State Office
440 West 200 South, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1345
http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en.html

Rec'd 11-27-13

IN REPLY REFER TO:
3809
(UT-9223)

STAFF REPORT

Title: Meeting Notes for Pleasant Mine on November 13, 2013

Author: Terry Snyder, Abandoned Mine Land and Surface Management Lead, Solid Minerals, Utah State Office (UT-9223)

Date: November 26, 2013

Summary of Meeting with the Mining Claimant for the Pleasant Mine

Location: Pleasant Mine at T. 13 S., R. 19 W., Sec. 31 in Juab County, Utah

Attendees: Bill Ronnow, Attorney for Mr. Rogers, Dale D. Rogers, mining claimant, Jeff Shields partner with Mr. Rogers, Lawrence Buhler, Attorney for Mr. Shields; Wayne Western, Division of Oil, Gas and Mining Minerals Reclamation Program Inspector and Paul Baker Administrator of the Minerals Reclamation Program for the Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining; and Duane Bays, Fillmore Field Office Surface Management Specialist, Mike Gates, Fillmore Field Office Manager, Michael Jackson, Certified Mineral Examiner, Vic Dunn, Certified Mineral Examiner, and Terry Snyder, P.G. Abandoned Mine Land and Surface Management Lead, Utah State Office.

The purpose of the on-site meeting was to resolve the following issues: 1) Noncompliance and Suspension Order; 2) type of permit needed to conduct proposed/desired activity and 3) common versus uncommon variety issue. The Noncompliance and Suspension Order was issued since there was earth work completed without an accepted notice or approved plan of operations. Mr. Rogers' had submitted a plan of operations in 2011 but it was an incomplete. Mr. Rogers' was notified of what additional information was required to make the plan of operations complete; however, this information was not submitted. Mr. Rogers affirms that he completed exploration and removal of abandoned vehicles without an accepted notice or an approved plan of operations. The project area has contact metamorphosed limestone on an east-facing slope where multiple, small diameter, relative shallow test holes had been drilled with portable drill and compressor. Top soil of minimal thickness had been removed from the outcrop.

Issue 1: Mr. Rogers dug a trench to examine the limestone below the colluvium contact which uncovered old vehicles that had been buried by another party prior to Mr. Rogers' exploration. He subsequently reclaimed the trench by removing all the vehicles and backfilling the trench. A culvert was put in on the east side of the trench. Mr. Rogers also placed a fence around the east perimeter of the drill-hole test area and posted a sign on the fence and posted a sign at the entrance road to the project area. Because the trench has been reclaimed, the vehicles were removed, and he has agreed to submit a notice before completing any additional surface disturbance, the noncompliance order will be considered resolved. A decision terminating the Noncompliance and Suspension Order will be issued by the Fillmore Field Office documenting the reclamation of the trench and that Mr. Rogers will comply with the regulations at 43 CFR 3809 before completing any additional work.

Issue 2: Regarding what type of permit is needed for the activity proposed was discussed. Mr. Rogers would like to drill and remove blocks within a delineated area of 100 feet x 100 feet. This area will be excavated approximately 3 feet deep. The material will be tested to determine chemical grade, brightness, reflectance, and other parameters to evaluate possible markets for this mineral. In addition, the total existing disturbance, approximately 2 acres, will be included in the notice. Based on the description of proposed activity at this time it would be appropriate to permit the activity as a notice. The notice will also include the fence and signs Mr. Rogers placed on the mine site. Mr. Rogers agreed to submit a notice that will address the above items. Additional information pertaining to notice contents can be found at 43 CFR 3809.301.
The incomplete plan of operations on file with BLM will be considered a draft and will be modified with the information obtained from the notice exploration activity. A complete plan of operations contains operator information, description of the operations, reclamation plan, monitoring plan and if appropriate an interim management plan during periods of temporary closure (43 CFR 3809.401). The revised plan of operations will contain this information and include the results from the notice level activity. The current Small Mining Operation (SMO) form on file with the State of Utah, Mineral Reclamation Program will satisfy their requirements. The SMO will also cover mining (plan of operations future submission) as long as the total disturbance is 10 or less acres. Of course the BLM plan of operations and the States SMO should contain the same information/proposed activity. The current bond on file with the Minerals Reclamation Program is $12,000. The bond will be reviewed to determine if it will address Mr. Rogers' reclamation obligations at the site once BLM received a complete notice. Review of Mr. Rogers' financial guarantee will be in accordance with 43 CFR 3809.552, 3809.554 and 3809.555.

Issue 3: Lastly the issue of common versus uncommon variety minerals was discussed. Michael Jackson will be the certified mineral examiner working on this project. During the development of the notice exploration sampling analysis plan Mr. Jackson will be consulted and the notice will need to address the specific sampling and testing to be completed. (The sampling alone may not be all that is needed, if a market analysis is necessary.) Mr. Jackson recommended tests to assess not only the physical attributes of the deposit but the chemical properties as well. He would also like to be present when the sampling is completed so he can obtain splits and observe the sampling process. Information obtained from the exploration will be evaluated by BLM to determine whether a mineral examination is required under 43 CFR 3809.101(a). A mineral examination for a mineral that may be a common variety mineral normally involves an evaluation of physical properties of the mineral and an evaluation of its distinct and special value based on market price and uses. If the exploration data is inconclusive, more extensive analysis

may be required through completion of a mineral examination report that is subject to cost recoverable fees to be paid by the operator or claimant in accordance with 43 CFR 3800.5 and 3000.11. A cost estimate would be prepared for the mineral examination, and the claimant would be afforded an opportunity to review and comment. If the mineral is a common variety, exploration and removal (mining) can be authorized under the regulations for mineral materials at 43 CFR 3600.

The meeting concluded at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Terry Snyder

cc: Attendees as listed above