



COLORADO
Division of Reclamation,
Mining and Safety
Department of Natural Resources

October 14, 2020

Mr. Jerald Schnabel
Castle Concrete Aggregates
7250 Allegheny Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80203

Mr. Bruce Humphries
RPM, Inc
25049 E. Alder Dr.
Aurora, CO 80016

RE: Adequacy Review; Technical Revision (TR-06); Pueblo East, Permit No. M-1986-015

Dear Gentlemen,

On September 25, 2020, the Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety (Division) received a request for Technical Revision (TR-06) to update and clarify the currently approved reclamation plan to account for existing site conditions at the Pueblo East Pit, Permit No. M-1986-015. Please be advised that on October 26, 2020, the application for TR-06 may be deemed inadequate and denied unless the following adequacy items are addressed to the Division's satisfaction. Please respond to the adequacy items with a letter summarizing each response, to the numbered items below, in a cover letter titled "Adequacy Review Response TR-06, M-1986-015".

1. **Cement Batch Plant.** As is indicated in TR-06 the batch plant release was begun in 2006. Maps associated with Amendments 3 and 4 approved in 2007 and 2011, respectively, all clearly portray the batch plant outside the permit boundary. No further action is needed.

PHASE 1:

2. The operator states that the average bottom elevation of the pit is 4561 feet above mean sea level (ft amsl) from a survey that was completed in 2007. The Division feels that this estimate is not accurate considering the amount of time that has passed (13 years) which could result in sedimentation filling the pit. The Division, using Google Earth Pro, estimated the bottom of the pit could be closer to 4575 ft amsl, which would result in a required depth of backfill difference of 43 to 27 feet. The operator should better define what the current average bottom of pit elevation is.
3. The operator states there is 61 acres that require backfilling. Please indicate on a map the outline of the 61 acres. The Division estimated that the area requiring backfill is approximately 42 acres.
4. Please clearly indicate on a map the additional sources of backfill. Include on the map the acreage of each phase and the volume of material of that phase. Please provide a demonstration that sufficient



material is available from the proposed phases. The Division is concerned that the locations of these phases are outside the currently approved affected land boundary and thus the material being sourced in the phases is not available for reclamation purposes.

5. Please clearly indicate on a map the sources of topsoil. Include on the map the acreage of each area and the volume of material of that location.
6. The Division was unable to find information that accounts for reclaiming the process area, breaking up slabs, removal of rebar, etc. Provide details such as the dimension of the slabs and how they are reinforced, the number and dimension of any footers, and any details pertaining to conveyors on site. Include a line item for reclaiming the processing area.

PHASE 2:

7. The operator states that there are 19 acres that require topsoil, please show this area on a map.
8. Line 3.1, please show on a map the areas of Phase 2 that still require grading to a 3:1 slope.
9. Line 3.3, please outline the 9 acre area on a map.
10. In line 3.5, the Division is referring to the 6 - 6.7 acre parcel that is located to the north of Phase 2 and west of Phase 1.

PHASE 7:

11. Please indicate on a map the areas that are separated by the 100-year flood plain and include on the map the volume of fill required in each area.
12. Please indicate where on a map the operator is anticipating sourcing the 593,583 cubic yards needed for backfill.
13. On a map show the areas where 3:1 slopes need to be established.
14. What is the average depth of exposed groundwater in Phase 7?
15. The operator states that soil amendments will be used in lieu of importing 14.6 acres of topsoil but there was no cost accounting for the proposed amendments, please provide.

General Comments:

16. Please clarify, the sum of the individual phase cost estimates do not match the cost estimate for all Pueblo East as stated on page 8.

17. The Division performed a cost estimate for Pueblo East Mine utilizing the material estimates the operator provided in TR-06. The cost estimate assumed backfill material had to be imported because the majority of onsite borrow sources were outside the affected land boundary. As a result the Division's estimate is exorbitant. The Division is seeking additional information and clarification to refine its estimate as it relates to current site conditions.

The Division is aware that the operator is working on submitting an Amendment to change the reclamation plan for Phases 1 and 7 to facilitate a Succession of Operators to CWPDA. However, until the Amendment is submitted and approved the Division is required to calculate a bond amount for reclamation at the site in its current state.

The decision date for TR-06 is October 26, 2020. If additional time is required to respond to these adequacy issues please submit a written request for extension of the review period. The Division reserves the right to further supplement this document with additional adequacy issues and details as necessary.

If you need additional information or have any questions, please contact me at Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety, 1313 Sherman Street, Room 215, Denver, CO 80203, by telephone at **303-866-3567 x8114**, or by email at patrick.lennberg@state.co.us.

Sincerely,



Patrick Lennberg
Environmental Protection Specialist

cc: Jared Ebert, Division of Reclamation, Mining & Safety
Daniel Cunningham, Division of Reclamation, Mining & Safety

ec: Jerald Schnabel, Castle Aggregates, Jerald_Schnabel@castleaggregate.com
Bruce Humphries, RPM, Inc., hlhumphries2@comcast.net