



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

October 29, 2024

Tim Strack  
American Gypsum Company LLC  
740 HWY 6  
Gypsum, CO 81637

**RE: Eagle-Gypsum Mine, File No. M-1984-041 , Technical Revision (TR-12) Adequacy Review #4**

Dear Mr. Strack:

On June 24, 2024, the Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety (Division) filed your Technical Revision request TR-12 for the Eagle-Gypsum Mine, Permit No. **M-1984-041**. The Division has reviewed the response to Adequacy Review #3. The following items need to be addressed:

**Exhibit L - Reclamation Costs**

1. Figure 4-1 shows that the upper section of the lower pit will be regraded entirely using cut/fill material, rather than backfilled as described in the Reclamation Plan. Please clarify that highwalls can be regraded using cut/fill method to a 3H: 1V slope without increasing the existing affected lands boundary. (An increase to the affected acreage would require an amendment to the permit, per Rule 1.1(6))
2. Based on Figures 1-1, 4-1 through 4-4, it appears that the topsoil stockpile and waste dump area to the west of the Lower Pit and the waste dump to the east of the Upper Pit is not proposed to be revegetated. Please clarify that these areas will be revegetated, and their acreage is included in the revegetation costs.

**Exhibit E - Reclamation Plan**

3. The Reclamation Plan 3.0 states "Culverts would be removed and native drainage channels would be re-established at pre construction grades" However culverts on the bonding spreadsheet are noted as being capped with concrete on either end and backfilled. Please clarify which method will be utilized and update Exhibits accordingly.
4. The Reclamation Plan 3.2 states that each of the three pits will be backfilled using overburden or interburden from other pits. Similar phrasing is also present in section 3.3. This appears to be inconsistent with how Exhibit L is calculated. Backfilling would require transporting material to the pit or having a stockpile placed above the highwall that could be pushed down. Neither of these scenarios currently exist. Please revise either Exhibit E or Exhibit L to provide consistency in how reclamation will be achieved on site.



5. The Reclamation Plan 3.2 states “haul roads would be regraded using cut-to-fill methods” however Exhibit L 4.3 and the bonding spreadsheet state “n/a, no regrading of roadways” and only have ripping, topsoiling and revegetation. Please either revise the Reclamation Plan or provide input data and costs for contouring of roadways, ensuring consistency between Exhibits E and L.
6. Section 3.7 states seeding methods will be hydroseeding. However, the bonding spreadsheets state drill seeding. Please clarify which method will be utilized and update exhibits accordingly.
  - a. Are the seeding rates provided in Table 3.2 for drill seed or hydroseed? Note that all methods other than drill seeding shall be at double the drill seeding rate.

### **Bonding Spreadsheet**

7. Exhibit L - Table 2.1 references using a CAT 815F compactor for compacting topsoil however the bonding spreadsheet states: “scope is included with grading”. Only a D10 is used for grading topsoil. Please include a task for compacting topsoil as stated in Exhibit L and Section 3.6 of Exhibit E.
8. For task A1001 no contouring has been included prior to the application of topsoil. The number of cubic yards to be graded in the topsoil task A1004 does not account for additional grading as indicated in the Summary Notes selection. Slopes for the Stockpile Staging Area are greater than 2.5H: 1V and require grading. Please provide data (create task(s)) to address this area.
9. Task A1003 hauling topsoil for the Stockpile Staging Area. 13,000 CY of topsoil is to be hauled. 4.9 ac at 6” deep is only 3,952 CY. Is the additional 9,048 CY of material hauled actually overburden for grading? If so, please create a separate task A1000 for the hauling of overburden with its own unique inputs.
  - a. Task A1001 for grading of this material should also be created.
10. Task A1004 is only grading 1,988 CY of topsoil while 13,000 CY was transported. There is no support dozer on the trucking task therefore the full transported volume would need to be graded. Please justify why a lesser volume is proposed to be graded or adjust the task accordingly.
11. What is the unit cost for topsoil material by CY delivered to the site? Please provide documentation of the quoted amount.
12. Except for Task A1003 and A1004, 3” of topsoil is to be imported from a 3rd party. However, this task does not address grading and blending of the other 3” of material sourced on site to create the 6” of topsoil as required by the Reclamation Plan.
  - a. If stockpiles are not immediately adjacent there should be a truck hauling task for the 3” of on-site topsoil material.
13. Task A4003 states “n/a, topsoil sourced 3rd party, delivered within 100’ of final placement” however a cost of \$3,564.19 is attributed to transporting 7,248 CY of material. Please clarify.
14. The total for task D1002 does not include all task items listed on the tab. The total should be \$221,325 rather than \$29,700.

15. Similarly on Task D1002 the total task hours is less than the total. Explain the rationale for not accounting for the total of the task hours.

Please submit your response(s) to the above listed issue(s) by Thursday October 31, 2024, in order to allow the Division sufficient time for technical review. If you cannot address the above issues by October 31, 2024, please request an extension to the decision due date to ensure adequate time for the Division to review materials. The current decision due date is **November 1, 2024**. If any adequacy issues remain by the decision due date the Division may deny your request.

The Division will continue to review your Technical Revision and will contact you if additional information is needed. If you require additional information, or have questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Amy Yeldell". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**Amy Yeldell**

Environmental Protection Specialist

Ec:

Travis Marshall, Senior EPS, DRMS

Amy Eschberger, Senior EPS, DRMS

Leigh Simmons, DRMS

Brittany Cocina, BLM