By Ron.

9/1/78

Protest to 5-M - Bennett Ra

Send Notice

1. Notice not given to Bennett of tent approval. Ans Mandatory but Bennett was not listed in MR1 or 2

2. Data as to mineral ownership, upon which t. approval is based is erroneous.

3. Mineral rights in subd. - belong to Fed. govt. - Contends that mining will take place under Silver Ref subdivision.

Ans - It may, but 5-M has committed to not mining under residences - we could specify an angle of draw for subsidence.

4. Interfers with the use of public roads. Roads have no bearing on the Div opp of M&R plan.

5. Visual impacts are not contemplated to be regulated in the UMCRA. No basis.

6. - This could be a well-based complaint. Need Mike to ✓.

7. Dumping is an inter-claimant problem.

8/1/78 - Protest to 5-M

Jack,

As far as I can tell, this protest only has one possible basis under the UMRA - that is #6 where the hydrologic system could be degraded. Lets get mike to look at it then try to get 5M & Bennett to settle their differences.

Do you see any other justified complaint?

Ron

Mike,

Could you quickly review objection #6 to see if there is a remote possibility that it could be justified?

ans. (9/1/)

Acid leach liquors will be contained by asphalt/rubber pad and dams. The dams will be large enough to contain runoff. See Page 5 of the pre-design conference (red folder) - the leachate solutions will be neutralized before covering ponds.

Why not give them a hearing?