Attachment 2.05.4(2)(d)-1 Walsh Report on Subsoil Suitability February 2008 (Revised July 2008)

2 Walsh

Environmental Scientists and Engineers, LLC

August 12, 2008

Mr. Ross Gubka Western Fuels Colorado LLC Box 628 Nucla Colorado 81424

Subject: REVISED Subsoil Suitability Study New Horizon Mine Walsh Project No. 7873-010

Dear Mr. Gubka:

Walsh Environmental Scientists & Engineers, LLC (Walsh) has performed a limited soil investigation and inspections of operations at the New Horizon Mine in Nucla, Colorado. Work was conducted under contract to Western Fuels – Colorado LLC (WFC). This letter describes investigation techniques, results, and their implication to mine operations and is a revision of the original soil investigation dated March 20, 2008. Revisions are based on comments received from the Division of Reclamation, Mining, and Safety (DRMS) in a letter dated May 28 2008.

Background

The New Horizon Mine mines coal under a DRMS permit. The permit defines soil handling procedures that have been followed by WFC. Prior to February 2008, the permit did not recognize any soil within the permit boundary as being "prime farmland" as defined in the DRMS regulations and by the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). Soil handling was consistent with the permit and the NRCS ruling prior to permit issuance that there were no prime farmland soils within the permit area. In February 2008, the NRCS determined that some of the soil within the permit boundary qualified as prime farmland. Some of that prime farmland had been mined and reclaimed, some had been mined but had not yet been fully reclaimed, and some of the material has not yet been mined. WFC has chosen to take steps to ensure that the unreclaimed mined area that has been reclassified as prime farmland is replaced with soil and subsoil that is suitable to restore prime farmland characteristics.

Mining Operations

Coal is mined by stripping topsoil in one or two lifts, mechanically stripping subsoil and weathered Dakota Formation bedrock overburden, blasting remaining bedrock overburden, and mining coal. The mining pit is backfilled first with the interburden and blasted overburden followed by placement of the weathered bedrock overburden, and finally the soil lift(s).

The working face of the mine reveals 10 to 30 feet of weathered sandstone and shale bedrock that has decomposed and is mostly friable (see photos). This material is called "Bench 1" or "overburden unit 1" material in the permit and by WFC. It grades imperceptibly into the overlying soil, and contains

Western Slope Division:

535 Grand Avenue . Grand Junction, Colorado 81501-2790 . Phone (970) 241-4636 . FAX (970) 241-4312 . walshenv.com

Corporate Office:

4888 Pearl East Circle, Suite 108 . Boulder, Colorado 80301-2475 . Phone (303) 443-3282 . FAX (303) 443-0367

root structures to a depth of greater than 10 feet depth. A single discontinuous layer of broken angular rock about six to twelve inches thick is present within much of the observed cut face. This is the only competent rock in the bench 1 cut face. The bench 1 material overlies competent overburden, which overlies the coal seams that are mined (see Photo 1). Bench 1 material is mechanically removed as a separate unit and is the last overburden unit to be placed over the reclaimed mine. As such there are generally several or more feet of the bench 1 material underlying replaced topsoil in the reclaimed areas.

Part of the area of the mine south of BB Road and west of 2700 Road (reclassified as prime farmland) and part of the area north of BB Road (non-prime farmland) have been mined and have had overburden placed, but have not had topsoil replaced (Figure 1). The suitability of the Bench 1 subsoil for use as the lower layer of prime farmland soil is the focus of this study.

Preliminary Investigation

On January 31, 2008, WFC personnel obtained six soil samples from the upper two feet of overburden (samples 101 through 106, Figure 1). The soil was analyzed for texture, conductivity, pH, nitrogen, organic matter, some anions and cations, calcium carbonate, moisture, and sodium adsorption ratio. A summary of results relevant to prime farmland soil is presented in Table 1 and the lab data sheet is attached to this letter. These samples were all within suitability criteria established in the permit and by the NRCS for prime farmland subsoil for target analytes with the exception of one sample which exceeded the electrical conductivity (soluble salts) suitability standard of 4.0 with a reading of 4.1 micromhos/cm.

Second Investigation

After a meeting with the DRMS, NRCS, WFC, and other personnel, WFC agreed to further analyze the condition of the subsoil by examining the soil in pits placed on a 2.5-acre grid (330 feet per side). These grid points were sequentially numbered across the portion of the mine that had been mined and partially reclaimed. Of the 34 grid points, twenty were within areas that had been brought to grade with overburden and were accessible (e.g. not covered with topsoil piles). These locations had soil pits excavated, with 13 south of BB Road (in prime farmland) and seven north of BB Road (in non-prime farmland) (sample points numbered 1 through 34, Figure 1). All pits were excavated in areas that had been brought to grade with overburden, but had not been prepared for topsoil placement or had topsoil placed. WFC dug pits using a backhoe to a depth of three to four feet. Walsh personnel visited the site on March 5, 2008 and described soil color, texture, percent coarse fraction (gravel, cobbles, stones, and boulders), and hardness. Information was recorded into a field notebook and transferred to Table 2. No boulders (>25 inches) were observed in any soil pit.

Soil samples were obtained from the upper two feet of the exposed soil. Samples from the prime farmland area and select samples from the non-prime farmland area were sent to Servi-Tech Laboratories of Hastings, Nebraska for pH, texture, calcium carbonate, and exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP) and other analyses. Laboratory results are summarized in Table 2. Selected lab analyses were based on discussions with David Dearstyne of the NRCS Montrose office. Mr. Dearstyne stated in an email dated February 20, 2008 that soil deeper than 24 inches in prime farmland should be tested for these parameters and compared to standards (shown on Table 2). If the soil is within these criteria it would provide suitable subsoil (copy of email correspondence is attached).

<u> ▲ Walsh</u>

Environmental Scientists and Engineers, LLC

USDA criteria for prime farmland state that the total topsoil plus subsoil depth must equal or exceed 40 inches. These criteria were used to modify the soil suitability criteria table (Table 2.04.9-2) in the DRMS permit.

All soil samples during the March 5 sampling event were within suitable ranges for selected analytes and field parameters. The upper two feet of subsoil was investigated, but there was no change observed to the total soil pit depth in any soil pit, suggesting that the soil suitability criteria would be met in the three to four feet of observed subsoil at all or most sampling locations.

Re-sampling for pH and Electrical Conductivity

Comments from the DRMS in a letter dated May 28, 2008 revealed that the March 5 subsoil analyses utilized 1:1 extract for the soil pH and electrical conductivity (EC), rather than the permit-required paste method for these analytes. Walsh discussed the situation with DRMS and NRCS personnel and determined that there is a proportional relationship between 1:1 extract and paste extract EC results. A published formula was applied to the 1:1 EC results, and revealed that up to four sample points may exceed the paste EC criteria of 4.0 (samples 21, 26, 32, and 33). Based on this, the eight sample points that had 1:1 EC higher than 1.2 were resampled and analyzed for paste EC (Table 2). WFC personnel resampled soil at the original sampling points using a 2" hand auger for a total depth of 24". A fraction of the extracted sample was placed in a zip-loc bag and shipped to Servi-Tech Labs of Hastings, Nebraska. The sampling points were located with a survey-grade GPS to match the March 5, 2008 sampling points. The sampled areas had not yet had topsoil placed at the time of sampling.

Of the eight samples obtained, two exceeded the topsoil permit criteria of 4. These were sample 21 with a paste EC of 4.34 and sample 32 with a paste EC of 7.33. The sample 32 location is near a topsoil pile, which may have affected this location. The samplers noted that as many as five attempts were made at sample 32 to get a complete hole due to refusal of the hand auger. This suggests that sample 32 may not be representative of the subsoil in the area.

Discussion

The original soil survey (Intermountain Resource Inventories, Inc., 1998) performed laboratory analyses on three soil profiles within the prime farmland unit south of BB Road. Of these three, four individual soil horizons from the approximately 24-48 inch subsoil interval were analyzed. Paste EC ranged from 0.7 to 3.8, with an average of 1.9. Percent CaCO₃ ranged from 3 to 36%, with an average of 17%. No cobbles, stones, or boulders were observed in the horizons, and lab analysis of gravel ranged from 9.1 to 31.5%, with an average gravel content of 20.7%. This indicates that the replacement subsoil has higher average paste EC (3.1%), lower CaCO₃ (2%-4%), and lower coarse fraction (11.7%) than the original tested subsoil. Sample averages are shown on tables 1 and 2.

Walsh discussed the impact of EC on crops with Mr. Dave Dearstyne of the NRCS, who indicated that crops are more sensitive to elevated EC in topsoil than in subsoil. Elevated EC in subsoil can impact established crops but not establishing crops, and established crops are generally more tolerant of elevated EC than establishing crops. Mr. Dearstyne stated that subsoil with a paste EC up to 6 would not be detrimental to grasses or alfalfa. As such, establishing a paste EC criterion of 6 for subsoil in prime farmland for the permit may be appropriate.

📤 Walsh

Environmental Scientists and Engineers, LLC

The bench 1 material that has been used as top dressing prior to soil placement has characteristics of suitable subsoil for use during reclamation, with the exception of elevated EC at one or two locations. There is sufficient bench 1 material available to provide 24 inches or more top dressing across the prime farmland areas that have been mined as of February 14, 2008. There may be sufficient bench 1 material to also place at least 12 inches on the non-prime farmland areas for use as suitable subsoil.

Please contact me at (970) 241-4636 if you have any questions on this matter. Thank you for selecting Walsh for your project.

Sincerely,

Walsh Environmental Scientists & Engineers, LLC

District Manager

Attachments: Figure 1 Photos Tables Laboratory analytical data NRCS email

Walsh

Environmental Scientists and Engineers, LLC



Photo 1: View of mine face showing Bench 1 material (upper face) and lower overburden material.



Photo 2: Bench 1 cut face cross-section; face is about 20 feet high.

Sample	pH	EC	Saturation	SAR	CaCO3	SF	Texture
l	(unitless)	mmhos/cm	(percent)	(unitless)	(percent)	(ppm)	(lab)
CRITERIA*	6.1-8.4	0-4.0	25-80	0-4.0	0-15.0	0-2.0	**
44946 (101)	8.0	2.9	55.0	1.7	2.1	<1.0	SCI
44947 (102)	7.8	3.3	53.0	0.9	2.0	<1.0	SCI
44948 (103)	7.9	2.4	56.0	0.7	1.3	<1.0	SCI
44949 (104)	7.7	3.5	45.0	0.9	2.9	<1.0	SCI
44950 (105)	7.6	4.1	63.0	0.9	1.4	<1.0	SCI
44951 (106)	8.0	2.3	42.0	1.0	2.2	<1.0	SCL
Average	7.8	3.1	52.3	1.0	2.0	<1.0	SCL

Table 1 - Subsoil Sample Results, January 31, 2008

Notes:

Bold indicates exceedance of suitability criteria * Based on Table 2.04.9-2 Criteria for Evaluating Soil Suitability ** All soil types are acceptable except for s, 1s, sc, sic, & c NA indicates that sample was not analyzed for specific parameter Sample numbers in parentheses are numbers shown on Figure 1

		stence																										
		Consi		SNH	H/S			Ш	_	S/R	HA	L	H3/HS	HS		HΛ	SH	HA	HA		SNH	HW	VI 1	¥L	HM	SH		
	%Rock	Frag's		15	80	23	2	4	16	7	17	30	6	4		11	12	11	22	0	7	e	01	2	11	7	11.65	
	%Stones	(10"-25")		0	0	1		0	1	0	2	5	0	0		1	2	1	2		1	0		-	1	0	0.95	<25% ave
	%Cobbles	(3"-10")		10	5	2		2	5	2	10	15	4	2		5	5	5	15		3	4	L	0	5	2	5.42	otal < 50%; <
	%Gravel	(2mm-3")		5	3	20		2	10	5	5	10	5	2		5	5	5	5		3	2	0	0	5	5	5.89	ţ
98	%	CaCO ₃		6.1	1.7	1.3		12.8	2.5	10.1	3.8	1.8	11.9	2.5		5.7	2	4.5	1	3.3	1.8	5.3		C.2	4.8	4.2	4.48	<40%
5, 20(11.	ESP		2	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	-	1		1	1	٢	2	L	1	-	c	S	1	1	1.25	<15%
June 2	texture	lab*		SCL	SCL	SCL		SCL	SCL	SL	SCL	SL	SCL	SCL		SL	SCL	SL	SCL	SCL	SCL	SCL	ico	SCL	SCL	SCL		sic, c
h 5 and	texture	field*		SCL	SCL	CL		NA	CL	SL	_	NA	SCL	CL	~	SL	NA	NA	SiL	NA	SCL	cL	ō	CL	NA	CL		* s, ls, sc,
Marc	Paste	EC		2.72									3.43	4.34		3.99	3.86			3.66			1	1.33	3.97			< 4
sults,	1:1	EC		1.36	1	1.07		0.52	1.08	0.72	0.94	0.55	1.36	2.19		1.24	1.22	0.85	0.33	1.64	0.42	1.03		4C. L	1.71	1.14	1.1	
ple Re		ors	0YR 6/3;			A	7.5YR	/3	10YR 2/1	0YR 6/6	ed		7.5YR 3/1	0YR 5/2	YR 5/6;		4	4	0YR 8/1	A		0YR 4/4;	0YR 7/6;		A			
soil Sam		Col	10YR 2/1; 1	10YR 6/4	10YR 5/2	Ż	2.5YR 4/4; 7	4/1;7.5YR 7.	7.5YR 4/4; 1	10YR 3/1; 1	vari	10YR 5/6	7.5YR 4/4; 7	3.5YR 4/3; 1	5YR 5/4; 10	10YR 3/1	Ż	Ż	10YR 4/4; 11	Ż	104R 4/2	10YR 4/3; 1, 5YR 5/3	10YR 2/1; 1	10YK 3/1	Ż	5YR 5/8		none
- Subs		Hd		7.9	00	7.6		8.2	1.9	8.1	7.8	8.2	7.9	80		7.9	7.9	7.9	8.3	7.8	8.2	7.9		20	7.9	80	7.97	4.5-8.4
Table 2		Sample		-	2	e		9	80	12	13	14	20	21		22	23	24	25	26	27	30	1	32	33	34	Average	Suitability 4

Soils compared to the USDA Soil Classification System; refer to this system for definition of terms and abbreviations Suitability based on Table 2.04.9-2 *Criteria for Evaluating Soil Suitability* • All soil types are acceptable except for s, is, sc. sic, & c NA indicates that sample was not analyzed for specific parameter Not all analytical data are shown; see attached lab data sheets for additional analytes No boulders were observed in any soil pit, as such they are not shown in this table. Coarse fragment values are based on visual estimate of cobble and stone volume and on sieve volume estimate of gravel. Notes:

	Tech 1602 Park West Dr. LAB NO: 44946 Tech Hastings 800.557,750 67215 aboratories 402,463,352 DATE RECEIVED: 67215 wsterificection Fax 402,463,3132 DATE RECEIVED: 02/01/		FIELD IDENTIFICATION:	Ammonum Acetate	A Promip Potessium Sulfur Catcum Magnesium Sodium Zing Inon Manganese C Appin P ppm R ppm R ppm R ppm R ppm Na ppm R ppm R ppm Na ppm R ppm R ppm R ppm Na ppm R p	5 141 469 <1	0 4 134 1240 <1 4738 711 83	0 4 127 352 <1	0 6 75 1440 <1 5162 542 69	0 6 142 2660 <1 4518 1254 101	5 88 214 <1 3721 469 69 69	Celic Sat Paste	d 03 Saturation Soli pH Electrical Calcium Magnesium Sodium Sodium 8. Mosti Conductivity, mont ca magnesium sodium sodium	1 55 7.8 mmbdom	0 53 7.87 3.29 5an 25n 108 nov	3 56 7.73 2.36 370 170 62 067	45 7.55 3.60 560 340 108 0.89	t 63 7.57 4.09 530 490 118 0.89	2 42 7.84 2.29 360 150 88 0.98	POUNDS ACTUAL NUTRIENT PER ACRE		N Pros Ko Zn S Mn Cu MgO B Ca Ci CEC %H %K	29 0 1	30 0 1	24 0 1	31 0 1	34 0 1	23 0 1		o days alter report of analysis Explanations of soil analysis terms are available upo Hans Burken λ_I , λ_i	Agronomist Atres Ball 02/08/2008
	⁷ ark W x 169 ngs, NE 7.7509 3.3522 2.463.8			4 munionium A	SIA	⊽	v	V	₩	V	V	Paste	Icium Ma	10	UD	2	09	30	60	LNUT		Mn				_	_		I	5	Ŕ
	1602 PO Bc Hastir 800.55 Fax 40:				Sulfur ppm Ib.	469	1240	352	1440	5660	214	Sat	tuctrical Ca	110/cm 4	20 5	36	.60 5	.09 5	29 3	ACTUA	-	ω 5	-		_	_				nalysis	
	ies				otassium ppm K	141	134	127	75 1	142 2	88		oil pH I Ele	7.8 m	87 3	.73 2	.55 3	.57 4	.84 2	SUNDS	$\left \right $	х Ко	-		_					port of al en	st
	h rator ^{echlabs.cc}		dehilch 3		A mqq	5	4	4	9	9	5		Moist.	55	53	56 7	45 7	63 7	42 7	Dd		92G					-			aner re ins Burk	gronom
	-Tec Labo		tion		N/A N	0	0	0	Ŷ	0	0	N Acetic	Acid aCO3 Se %	2.1	2.0	1.3 ~	2.9	1.4	2.2			z							T C	ou uays Ha	Ϋ́
	Servi	ADO	Cd Reduct	Nitrata Mit-	di mqq	2	е	e	⊽	e E	2	0.4	Clay C	28	24	26	20	32	8		raise pH to:	0.7								י בומא ובח	
Г			Mod. WB	- Omanir	Matter	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	drometer	۶ ال	14	16	16	12	16.1	16		CC Tons/A to	6.5				_			000	ed and	ed By:
		UELS-(Excess %	Lime	Ŧ	Ī	2	Ī	9	Ī	Hyd	Sand %	58	60	58	68	1.9	64		Lime, E	6.0	_				_		S	Review	Approv
	ULADO	IERN F	1	/ater-Soil Sol. Salts	mholom	1.08	1.74	0.77	1.29	1.94	0.73	-	5	=	-	-	e	6			Vield	809								-	
	AINE 24	WES		Buffer 5	- 				+	-	-		al Classificati	Clay Loar	Clay Loar	Clay Loar	Clay Loar	Clay Loar	Clay Loar.	s:									ndira se		
	1 28 128 128 142 142	S FOR:	1:1 Voter Call	Soil	Ŧ	8.0	8.1	6./	1.1	0.0	Ø.U		Soil Textur	Sandy	Sandy	Sandy	Sandy	Sandy	Sandy	DATION	Crop To Pe Gmum								le samu		
STER	N HOF N HOF CLA, C	ESULT	F	Sample	Depth						- n		Sample Depth	0-0	0-0	0 - 0	0-0		n	MMEN									tive of th		
M	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	YSIS R	SED:	aple	2	5 6	3 8	3 2	5 8	2 40	3	ED:	al c	10	8	8	4	2 4					-		, 4				presenta		

SOIL ANALYSIS REPORT

06	a de la competition de la comp		Beren											1.2.80									10		
1 - 489 72 2/2008 3/2008	DND		Cepper ppm.cu											412.414	1975										
4898 6724 03/12 03/15	FARM		Manganèse ppm Min																	•					
öË	PRIME		Iron ppm Fe											NUX EX											
): E NO: RECEIV REPOR	GANS		Zine ppm Zn											Constant of the second s											
AB NG NVOIC DATE F	N: MOR		Sedium.	114	94	80	57	72	36	57	48	20	107	100000											
	CATIO	Sale of	lagnesium ppm Mg	565	725	1186	466	776	380	626	254	819	850	Standing -	No.							-			
551 Dr. 68902 132	ENTIFIC	cetate	Caldum ppm Ca	5028	3716	4000	4701	4128	4574	5077	2488	5399	8220		Sodium disorption Parto	1.64	1.19	0.81	0.78	0.82	0.53	0.68	0.78	0.74	1.18
ork We 0x 169 03, NE 03,3522 3,3522 2,463,81	IDI OT	Ammonium	\$	7420	6980	13800	1870	6770	5690	10500	1620	7340	31500		Sodium np/L Na.	167	136	106	62	94	54	74	57	80	142
Fax 40	Handler of the second		Sultur ppm [b	1030	970	1920	260	940	790	1460	225	1020	4370	at. Paste	ng/L Mg	230	320	500	108	320	180	270	101	250	380
es Se			ppm K	140	102	119	128	114	73	105	51	140	126	0000000	alpium M	510	470	480	300	480	500	440	233	470	470
			bsphanus Po		-										sturation C	41	42	46	38	40	34	41	34	49	47
-Tect abol			£	-	-									N Abelio Acid	aco3	6.1	1.7	1.3	12.8	2.5	10.1	3.8	1.8	11.9	2.5
	VDO				 						-			20	Clay %	20	25	28	24	24	14	24	14	29.9	24
and and and	OLOR/		Organic	\vdash	-								-	trometer	No.	20	14.9	18	16	16	16	18.1	10	16	18
U L	JELS C		xcoss %	I	2	P	I	P	ī	ī	P	ī	2	AL STREET	put	60	30.1	54	60	60	70	6.73	76	1.1	58
RADO	ERNF	ter-Sol	I. Saks Enholom	.36	.00	1.07	0.52	80.	0.72	.94	0.55	.36	2.19			_	-	_		-		-		-	-
-COLO NE -0628	WEST	Na la	iuffine So pH			-		-	-	-	-	-	2		il Classificatio	Clay Loan	ly Loam	Clay Loan	ly Loam	Clay Loan	Clay Loan				
FUELS ZON MI H AVE 81424	FOR:	1.1 let-Soil	B Hd	6.7	8.0	7.6	8.2	6.7	8.1	8.7	8.2	6.7	9.0		Soll Texture	Sandy	Sandy (Sandy (Sandy (Sandy (Sand	Sandy (Sand	Sandy (Sandy
HORU 6 W 51 6 W 51 1 A, CO	SULTS	Ma	Depth	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24		emple. Depth	- 24	- 24	- 24	-24	1-24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24	- 24
VES NEW PO B NUCI	SIS RE	ä	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	D:		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<mark>Е 8</mark>	NALY	OD USE	Semple	SS-0	SS-0	SS-0	SS-06	SS-0	SS-12	SS-1:	SS-14	SS-2(SS-2	D USE	Semple	SS-01	SS-02	SS-03	SS-06	SS-08	SS-15	SS-13	SS-14	SS-20	SS-21
CLE	SOIL	METH	Lab	18981	18982	18983	13984	18985	18986	18987	8988	6868	06681	NETH	timber	18981	18982	18983	18984	18985	18986	18987	8988	18989	06681

Analyses are representative of the samples submitted Samples are retained 30 days after report of analysis Explanations of soil analysis terms are available upon request Reviewed and Hans Burken Analysis Explanations of soil analysis terms are available upon request Page 1 of 2 Approved By: Agronomist 03/19/2008 5:11 pm

		it.			SO	IL A	NA	ž	SIS	R	PO	RT									
CLE 23	WT: 490 27645 1 27645 1 27645 1 27645 1 200 BOJ	ern Fuels-Colo Iorizon Mine N 5th ave X 628 , Co 81424-0628	JRADO LL	ن.	And the second s	Late	ech ooratc	ories	2025845	02 Park 1 Box 1 1 Box 1 1 Box 1 1 Box 1 2.463.37 2.463.37 2.463.37	NE 68 NE 68 09 322 33.8132	D.		AB NC NOICI ATE R ATE R	E NO:	(ED:	48 67 03 03	1981 - 2472 1/12/20 1/19/20	4899 008 008	0	[]
SOIL	ANALYSIS RESU	ILTS FOR: WEST	TERN FUE	ICO-ST	ORAD	0			Contraction of the second	FIELD	IDEN	TIFICA	TION	MOR	GANS	PRIM	IE FAF	SMLA	QN	1417.00	12
FERT	LIZER RECOMN	IENDATIONS:						POU	NDS AC	TUAL	NUTR	ENT F	PERA	CRE		Γ	Cati	on Ex	cchar	oge	1
Lab Number	Sample	Crop To Be Grown	Yield Goal	Lime, ECC	Tons/A to rais 8.5	e pH to: 7.0	N P20	88	۶,	n	ų	ō	NgO	80	Ge	5	CEC %H	Capa	city %oa %	N% DW	g
48981	SS-01				T			\vdash				t	T	+	+	Ť	31	-	82	15	N
48982	SS-02				-				-				\square	$\left \right $	\vdash	Ê	25	-	13	24	N
48983	SS-03				-	-		-				t	\uparrow		-		31	-	65	32	-
48984	SS-06					-								-	\vdash	Γ	28	F	84	14	F
48985	SS-08								_			t				Γ	28	-	74	53	-
48986	SS-12				-			-			Γ		T				26	-	87	12	-
48987	SS-13											T		\vdash		Γ	31	-	8	17	-
48988	SS-14				t	$\left \right $	$\left \right $								\uparrow		15	-	84	14	-
48989	SS-20							-				1		\uparrow	-		5	-	78	8	-
48990	SS-21					\vdash					ľ			\vdash			49	-	84	4	-
SPEC	IAL COMMENTS	AND SUGGESTI	ONS:		a data da	States and states of a list		A LANGE STATE					A REPORT OF	A THE PARTY	Total and the second	nun landa en		294.02 294.02			
Lab N W/P Lab N	lumber(s):48981, RNING: Soluble umber(s):48981.	48989, 48990 salts level indicate 48982, 48983, 489	s potentia 184, 48985	alinity 48986	problei 48987.	ms. Ple 48988.	ase call 48989.4	V NOU V 18990	vish us.	to run	a soil s	alinity	test or	for ad	ditions	al infor	rmation	L L			r
CE	C calculated by c umber(s):48981.	ation summation in 48982, 48983, 489	1ay overes 184. 48985	timate ti 48986	rue CE(48987.	2 and ur 48988.	derestim 48989. 4	hate ex 18990	change	able so	1 unipo	Dercen	tage (I	ii (dse	n soils	contai	ining e	excess	lime	N.	
Ser	vi-Tech Laborato	ny fertilizer recomm	iendations	were no	ot reque	sted.					66669	1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 1999 199		201200		NY CET				1	
											·										
	1980																				
									0.534												
																- 2					
								-													
Analyse	s are representative	e of the samples sub	mitted	Sample	s are re	tained 30) days afte	sr repor	t of ana	ysis	Exp	anation	ns of so	il analy	rsis ten	ms are	availat	ble upo	on req	luest	
			ш ч	Approved	d By:		Agror	Burken	20		J. Marrie	s-B	e la				03/16	Page 9/2005	8 5:1·	1 pm	_

21430 Description, licentron, licentr	21490	Z														1000						
SOIL ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR: WESTERN - IUELS-COLORADO FIELD IDENTIFICATION: MORGANIS FRIME FARMA METHOD USED: Manual and a manual and a manual and a manual and and a manual and and a manual and a manual a		NUZ	7646 W O BOX UCLA, 1	5TH A 628 CO 81	VE 424-06	8		amin d'ante	Serv	li-Tec Labo	rato rato	ries em	Hast 800.5 Fax 4	ings, NI 557.7505 163.3522 102.463.8	E 68902 3132	and an	INVOIO DATE DATE	RECEN	/ED: (TED:	6724 03/15 03/15	72 2/2008 0/2008	
METHOD USED: Willing Willing Willing Memanyanana Ammanyana Ammanyana <th< th=""><th>SOIL AN</th><th>ALYSIS</th><th>RESUL</th><th>TS FO</th><th>R: WE</th><th>STERN</th><th>FUELS</th><th>COLO</th><th>RADO</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>- Manual and an</th><th>IELD IC</th><th>DENTIF</th><th>ICATIC</th><th>IOM:NO</th><th>SIGANS</th><th>PRIME</th><th>FARM</th><th>IAND</th><th>1.1112</th></th<>	SOIL AN	ALYSIS	RESUL	TS FO	R: WE	STERN	FUELS	COLO	RADO				- Manual and an	IELD IC	DENTIF	ICATIC	IOM:NO	SIGANS	PRIME	FARM	IAND	1.1112
Wile with the standing wi	METHOD	USED:		Water Sol		Vater-Soil								Ammoniun	Acetale		1000	Sec. Al				
4891 SS-22 0-24 7.9 1.24 H	Lab	Sample ID	Sample	PH	Buffer	Sol. Selis Inmho/om	Excess Lime	M Organic			Phosphorus ppm P	Polassium ppm K	uid Sult	P SA	Caldum ppm Ca	Magnoskum ppm Mg	Sodkum ppm Na	Zind ppm Zn	lron ppm Fe	Manganose ppm Ma	Copper ppm.Cu	Borton Ppm B
46802 SS-23 0.24 7.3 1.22 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 2.200 4.400 4.66 5.90 7.80 4.90 3.22 4.9 1.02 </td <td>48991</td> <td>SS-22</td> <td>0-24</td> <td>7.9</td> <td></td> <td>1.24</td> <td>Ξ</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>81</td> <td>1110</td> <td>2990</td> <td>4795</td> <td>402</td> <td>62</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	48991	SS-22	0-24	7.9		1.24	Ξ					81	1110	2990	4795	402	62					
48080 SS-24 0-24 7,9 0.38 H 1	48992	SS-23	0-24	7.9		1.22	P					92	2000	14400	4945	550	78					
48064 SS-25 0 - 24 (3) 10.3 Lo 1 13	48993	SS-24	0-24	7.9		0.85	Ξ					81	1080	7780	4930	332	49					
48986 SS-26 0-24 7.8 1.64 1.0 1	48994	SS-25	0-24	8.3		0.33	2					137	84	605	2997	758	89					
48906 SS-27 0 - 24 7,9 1,03 HI 1	48995	SS-26	0-24	7.8		1.64	P					170	2290	16500	6360	1313	83					
48897 SS-30 0-24 7.9 1.03 H 1.03 H 1.03 H 660 666 669 </td <td>48996</td> <td>SS-27</td> <td>0-24</td> <td>8.2</td> <td></td> <td>0.42</td> <td>P0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>126</td> <td>67</td> <td>698</td> <td>3206</td> <td>568</td> <td>61</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	48996	SS-27	0-24	8.2		0.42	P0					126	67	698	3206	568	61					
48986 SS-32 0 - 24 1,3 1,1 Hi 1 1,3 1,30 1,300 4,300 5,33 204 3 204 3 204 3 204 3 3 48986 SS-33 0 - 24 1,3 1,1 Hi 1 1 1,0 1470 10600 5465 623 60 99 3 3 3 48901 SS-34 0 - 24 Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam 546 623 60 70 7 3 4891 Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam Sandy Loam 541 15.3 20.4 7 7 7 4892 SS-25 0 - 24 Sandy Cay Loam 64 5.7 34 450 7 61 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	48997	SS-30	0-24	7.9		1.03	Ξ					141	650	4680	5038	567	69					
46868 SS-33 0 - 24 7.9 1.71 H1 N 95 2220 16100 6660 99 N N 40000 SS-34 0 - 24 8.0 1.14 H1 N 104 1470 10600 5465 523 60 N N N MINEMATION Same Sa	48998	SS-32	0-24	8.0		1.54	Po					130	1850	13300	4430	823	204					
48000 SS-34 0 - 24 6.0 1.14 HI 1 104 1470 10600 5455 523 60 1 METHOLUSED: Mathematical propertion Standard standardination Standard standardination 114 HI 106 5455 523 60 503 <	48999	SS-33	0-24	7.9		1.71	Ŧ					95	2520	18100	6680	806	66					
METHOD USED: Parameter Processes State State </td <td>49000</td> <td>SS-34</td> <td>0-24</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>•</td> <td>1.14</td> <td>Ŧ</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>104</td> <td>1470</td> <td>10600</td> <td>5465</td> <td>623</td> <td>60</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	49000	SS-34	0-24	8.0	•	1.14	Ŧ					104	1470	10600	5465	623	60					
Winter Standing <	VETHOD	USED:						Hydrometer		0:4 N Aceto	Accession of the		Sat Paste			10/2/381	ang da	<u>K</u> wana	1000	2.14.2		100
4891 SS-22 0 - 24 Sam0y Learm 70.1 13.9 16 5.7 34 450 190 86 0.86 1 1 101 1 <td>Number</td> <td>Sample</td> <td>Depth</td> <td>2</td> <td>fexturnal Class</td> <td>lication</td> <td>Sand</td> <td>50 %</td> <td>-Clay K</td> <td>Ca003</td> <td>Saturation % Molst</td> <td>Caldum mg/L Ca</td> <td>Magnesium mort Mo</td> <td>Sodium mp/L Na</td> <td>Sodium Adsorption Ratio</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Number	Sample	Depth	2	fexturnal Class	lication	Sand	50 %	-Clay K	Ca003	Saturation % Molst	Caldum mg/L Ca	Magnesium mort Mo	Sodium mp/L Na	Sodium Adsorption Ratio							
46982 SS-23 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Loam 64.9 15.1 20 2.0 35 460 290 111 1.01 0.01	48991	SS-22	0-24		Sandy Lo	E	70.1	13.9	16	5.7	¥	450	190	86	0.86							
48983 SS-24 0 - 24 Sandy Loam 68 16 4.5 31 500 150 67 0.67 0 <	48992	SS-23	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay	oam	64.9	15.1	20	2.0	35	460	280	111	1.01							
4894 SS-25 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Learn 54.1 15.9 30 1.0 51 90 40 59 1.30 9 9 48995 SS-25 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Learn 51.9 20.1 26 3.3 48 400 350 82 0.72 9 9 9 48995 SS-27 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Learn 56 16 26 1.8 52 110 40 43 0.89 9	48993	SS-24	0-24		Sandy Loi	m	68	16	16	4.5	31	500	160	67	0.67							
48985 SS-26 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Loam 51.9 20.1 28 3.3 48 400 350 82 0.72 9 9 9 48995 SS-27 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Loam 56 16 26 1.8 52 110 40 43 0.89 9	48994	SS-25	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay	neo	54.1	15.9	30	1.0	51	60	40	59	1.30							
48995 SS-27 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Loam 56 16 26 1.8 52 110 40 43 0.89 0 170 43 0.89 0 170 43 0.89 0 170 43 0.89 0 170 85 0.84 0 0 1<0 1 <th1< td=""><td>48995</td><td>SS-26</td><td>0-24</td><td>Sa</td><td>ndy Clay</td><td>-oam</td><td>51.9</td><td>20.1</td><td>28</td><td>3.3</td><td>48</td><td>400</td><td>350</td><td>82</td><td>0.72</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th1<>	48995	SS-26	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay	-oam	51.9	20.1	28	3.3	48	400	350	82	0.72							
48897 SS-30 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Loam 56 19 25 5.3 40 500 170 85 0.84 48998 SS-32 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Loam 59.9 18.1 22 2.5 4.2 450 340 330 2.86	48996	SS-27	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay I	-oam	56	16	28	1.8	52	110	40	43	0.89							
48998 SS-32 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Learn 59.9 18.1 22 2.5 42 450 340 330 2.86 A 48999 SS-33 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Learn 62 13 25 4.8 38 450 350 139 1.19 A 48999 SS-33 0 - 24 Sandy Clay Learn 62 13 25 4.8 38 450 360 139 1.19 A	48997	SS-30	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay	-oam	56	19	25	5.3	40	500	170	85	0.84							
48999 SS-33 0-24 Sandy Clay Loam 62 13 25 4.8 38 450 350 139 1.19	48998	SS-32	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay	oam	59.9	18.1	22	2.5	42	450	340	330	2.86							
	48999	SS-33	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay	oam	62	13	25	4.8	38	450	350	139	1.19							
49000 55-34 0-24 Sanay day Loam 62 1 16 22 4.2 30 430 20 12 0.07	49000	SS-34	0-24	Sa	ndy Clay	meo-	62	16	22	4.2	35	450	250	72	0.67							

Page 1 of 2 03/19/2008 5:12 pm Now Bal Hans Burken Agronomist Reviewed and Approved By:

	48991 - 49000 672472 03/12/2008 03/19/2008	ARMLAND	Capacity	%H %K %Ca %Mg %Na 1 86 12 1	1 83 15 1	1 89 10 1	2 68 29 2	1 73 25 1	2 75 22 1	1 82 15 1	1 73 23 3	1 82 16 1	1 83 16 1		ig excess fime.		allable upon request
	s NO: Olce NO: E RECEVED: E REPORTED:	IORGANS PRIME	o o	26		28	22	4	24	34	30	4	33		P) in solis containi P) in solis containi P) in solis containi		analysis terms are av
ORT	est Dr. LAB 68902 INVX 1132 DAT	ITRIENT PER ACE	a Cu MGO B								-				um percentage (ES		Explanations of soll a
SIS REP	1602 Park W PO Box 169 Hastings, NE 800.557.7509 Fox 402.463.8525 Fox 402.463.8	INDS ACTUAL N	2 5 S												oxchangeable sodi 0 1 1 wish is to run a s		ort of analysis
- ANALY	i-Tech Laboratorie	NOd	z z z												8998, 48999, 49000 nd underestimate e 8998, 48999, 49000 sd		ted 30, days after rep
SOIL	S. S	ELS-COLORADO	Lime, ECC Tons/A to raise pH t	6.0 8.5 7.0											5, 48996, 48997, 48 stimate true CEC a 5, 48996, 48997, 48 s were not requeste a safinity problems	s di boos de Summe et	Samples are retain
	LS-COLORADO LI MINE VE 124-0628	R: WESTERN FUI	Yiek											JGGESTIONS:	8993, 48994, 4899 (mation may overe 8993, 48994, 4899 893, 48994, 4899 899 899 81 indicates octentis		mples submitted
	WESTERN FUE NEW HORIZON 27646 W 5TH AN PO BOX 528 NUCLA, CO 814	IS RESULTS FOR	Crop Te Be Grow							-				MENTS AND SU): 48991, 48992, 4 (ted by cation sum (: 48991, 48992, 4 (aboratory fertilize (: 48995, 48998, 4 Solithie safts leve	Mai euse almios	esentative of the sai
	CLIENT: 21490	SOIL ANALYS	Lab Sample Number ID	48991 SS-22	48992 SS-23	48993 SS-24	48994 SS-25	48995 SS-26	48996 SS-27	48997 SS-30	48998 SS-32	48999 SS-33	49000 SS-34	SPECIAL CON	Lab Number(s) CEC calcula Lab Number(s) SetNi-Tech (Lab Number(s) WARNING	*Devinersiù Ka	nalyses are repr

•

N D S N N	ESTEF EW HC 646 W BOX ICLA, 1	N FUE RIZON 5TH A 628 CO 81-	a Mine Mine VE 424-062	-ORADC 8	LLC.	·•	Ser	Laber	ch oratc ^{vitechlabs.}	ries) 77 7 <u>8</u> 6 6	02 Par 08 05 Par 18 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	k West 69 509 522 53.8132	902 F.		AB NO NVOICE NTE RI	NO: ECEIVED: EPORTED		7505 - 73389 3/25/2(
SIS F	RESUL	TS FO	R: WES	STERN F	:UELS-(OLO	RADO					FIELC	DEN	TIFIC/	ATION				
	Sample Depth	Soil pH	Electrical Conductivity mmhorem										-	-	-	╞	-	-	-
-	0-0	7.68	2.72		-								-	+-	╀	╎	+	_	+
ç.	0-0	7.83	3.43										_	-	+				-
5	0-0	7.88	4.34											<u> </u>	╞	-		-	-
N	0-0	7.68	3.99										-	+	-			-	-
n	0-0	7.61	3.86											-	-		-	-	-
9	0-0	7.8	3.66	-									-		-		-	+-	
7	0-0	7.43	7.33											-	+-	-	-		-
36)	0-0	7.8	3.97									_	-	-	┼	╈			
RECC	MME	VDATIC	:SNC							POUNI	S AC	TIAL	NITER	ENTE					
		Crop Tc		Yield	Lime, t	ECC Tons/	A to raise pl-	to:	-								Ţ	Cat	
		000000		Goal	6.0	9	2	z	PzOs	Š Š	μŽ	s	ЧИ	ñ	OgM	0 8	IJ	CEC WH	Capac wk
													F						
						_		-				-			-				
				_				_	_						-				
				-			-		-									-	
				_	_	_	_	-										-	
				_	_	_	-	-	_										
. 19					_	_	_	-	_	_		-	-		-				
(or					_	_	_						-						
MME	NTS A	ND SU	GGESTI	IONS:						1									
s): 575 I ahoi	05, 57 atopy f	506, 57 ertilition	7507, 57 :	508, 575	09, 575	10, 57	511, 5	7512											
	aroi			Inelluatio	IS WELE		isanba	eg.											

Explanations of soil analysis terms are available upor Page -Diffusor Bud -

Samples are retained 30 days after report of analysis Reviewed and Hans Burken Approved By: Agronomist

resentative of the samples submitted

Edward Baltzer

From:	Dearstyne,	David - Montrose,	CO [David.D	Dearstyne@co.usda.g	jov]
-------	------------	-------------------	-------------	---------------------	------

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2008 10:47 AM

To: Edward Baltzer

Cc: Boyd, Jim - Norwood, CO; fcompton@walshenv.com; rgubka@wfcnucla.org

Subject: RE: New Horizon Mine

Hi Edward,

I could suggest sampling for the following items, pH, EC, texture estimate (using the ribbon or similar method), soil color, effervescence (presence or absence of carbonates), estimate of % RF's (rock fragments) - sizes and amount by volume. I would split any layers within this subsoil that are contrasting (came form different replacements) in any of these characteristics. If your sample indicates significant effervescence using HCL (1N), or visual observations of significant calcium carbonate (masses, threads, coats on frags) you may opt to collect a sample and run a calcimeter to determine the CaCO3 equivalent. This is a simple test that usually takes about 3 to 5 minutes to run and requires just a couple of test items and chemicals (10% HCL). It is usually run inside. This is a more comprehensive list. If you just wanted to describe essentials only, they would be in my estimation texture, pH, EC if pH is above 8.4, and amount and sizes of RF's.

Using this information, you can then compare to the requirements for Prime Farmland and to the soil descriptions of the original soils found on the site (In this case the Barx or Devinny soils). You also have the data collected by Intermountain Resources to help you as a baseline for comparison. I would suggest keeping in mind some of the conversations we had during our meeting on the 15th, when comparing the replaced subsoil with the PF requirements. For most agricultural uses, the topsoil is much more significant than the subsoil (though in our conversations you can't assume that anything replaced will suffice for subsoil requirements). Hope this helps. If you have difficulties developing a list of parameters for subsoil replacement characteristics using this information, please feel free to contact me and we can discuss this further.

Dave

From: Edward Baltzer [mailto:ebaltzer@walshenv.com] Sent: Monday, February 18, 2008 9:50 AM To: Dearstyne, David - Montrose, CO Cc: fcompton@walshenv.com; rgubka@wfcnucla.org Subject: New Horizon Mine

Dear David:

We are proposing to sample the top two feet of subsoil that has been placed over the 98E (Prime Farmland) mined portion of the New Horizon Mine. It will have approximately two feet of reclaimed topsoil placed over it.

Please provide an analyte list that you think is appropriate to determine if the placed suboil is appropriate for the lower horizons of soil. THank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Edward M. Baltzer Walsh Environmental Scientists & Engineers, LLC 535 Grand Avenue Grand Junction, Colorado 81501-2790 (970) 241-4636 ebaltzer@walshenv.com

3/17/2008

Resampling of Suitable Subsoil on Prime Farmland Soil Areas and Corresponding Results

As is seen from the lab results of 6/27/08, eight samples were re-run based on saturation paste extract for conductivity in the placed subsoil in prime farmland soils prior to February 2008. Seven of these samples were acceptable, as seen in the included lab sheet, page Attachment 2.05.4(2)(d)-1-14. One sample, #32, still showed a high level of 7.33 mmhos/cm. Surrounding samples were then taken according to the procedures outlined in the approved permit at the time. The surrounding remediation test samples (4) around site #32 passed. See lab results on page Attachment 2.05.4(20(d)-1-17&18. Since the surrounding test sites passes, no further testing or action was needed for that site.

Sample site #32 will be resampled under the new second phase sampling procedures outlined in Permit Revision 06, and will be remediated if necessary.

There was some question about sample site #21 being elevated, so four more remediation test samples were taken and those passed as well. See lab results on page Attachment 2.05.4(2)(d)-1-17&18. The results on the following pages all show acceptable results in the surrounding area.

0
Ô.
ш
~
S
S
1
\mathbf{Z}
Z
0
Ũ,

	i-Tech Laboratories	www.servitechlabs.com
Same a	Ser	Current services and the service of

LAB NO: INVOICE NO: DATE RECEIVED: DATE REPORTED:	
1602 Park West Drive PO Box 169 Hastings, NE 68902 800.557.7509 402.463.3522 Fax 402.463.8132	

	1		50																		
9593 8 8		:	88	-												,					
86 - 56 621 18/200 26/200			Coppe ppm C																		
595 673 08/1 08/2			Manganese ppm Mn																		
ë			lron ppm Fe					-													
NO: ECEIVI EPOR			Zinc pm Zin																		
B NO. VOICE TE RE			num 1 Na	52	5	<u>م</u>	9		31	5	51		ium ption tio	52	85	02	87	41	28	73	47
B B E	LION:		tum Sod	e e	7	6	6	5	÷	8	1		n Sod la Adsor Ra	ö	õ	ö	õ	ō		0	1.
02	FICA		Magnes ppm N	8	551	750	495	428	652	429	455		n Sodiur mg/L N	75	10	92	104	47	160	85	172
522 509 53.8132 53.8132	DENT	m Acetate	Calcium ppm Ca	5870	4419	48240	4056	5770	4747	4169	6181		Magnesiur mg/L Mg	390	290	440	300	216	370	260	290
stings, 16 557.77 2.463.38 402.44	ELD	Ammoniu	lb. S/A	13800	10800	30600	10900	7460	10600	7010	17000	Sat. Paste	Calcium mg/L Ca	910	590	590	580	640	570	590	560
2075845 075845	E State		ppm Suff	1911	1493	4251	1516	1036	1473	973	2365		iectrical nductivity mhorcm	3.23	3.58	4.00	3.49	3.04	3.92	3.27	3.68
ries bs.con			mikssium Pm K	11	87	103	65	75	86	64	67		Hd 10 Hd 10 H 05 F	.68	7.5	.78	.68	7.8	.76	7.8	.81
techia			horus Pol				-						ation Sr olst.	6	80	-	8		3	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	6
			nqq ppn									etic	3 Satur % Mi	m —	ñ	4	ñ	τ. Έ	4	4	ň
L'-1				L								0.4 N Ac Acid	င်ရင် ဂ	2.1	1.6	2.7	1.7	4.4	1.8	2.4	2.3
Sel	RADC												Clay %	19	21	25	21	21	21	19	19
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			% Organic Metter									Hydrometer	% (SH	12	16	12	14	15	15	12	12
LLC.	UELS.		Excess										Sand %	69	63	63	65	64	64	69	69
RADO	ERNF		I. Salts hho/cm										e i		-	-		-	_	-	
COLO VE 0628	NEST		Her H	-				-					Classificatio	Loam	lay Loan	lay Loan	lay Loan	lay Loan	lay Loarr	Loam	Loam
JELS- JELS- AVE 31424-	OR		B -										oli Textural	Sandy	Sandy C	Sandy	Sandy				
RN FI ORIZC V 5TH V 5TH C 52 C 52	LTSF		Ъ			-	-	-	-		-		ð	4	4	-		*	*	+	
/ESTE EW H 7646 V 0 BO) UCLA	RESU		Sample Depth	0-2	0-5	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-2	0 - 27	0 - 24		Sample Depth	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-2	0-2
<u>SZNĒZ</u>	YSIS	ISED:	ejdug D	1WEST	1EAST	NORTH	SOUTH	NORTH	2WEST	2EAST	S-31	SED:	inple D	IWEST	1EAST	NORTH	SOUTH	NORTH	WEST	2EAST	3-31
ENT:	ANAL	HOD	ŭ.	SS-2	SS-2	SS-21	SS-21	SS-32	SS-3	SS-3	Ś		ŝ	SS-2.	SS-2	SS-21	SS-21	SS-32	SS-32	SS-3	ы С
ר כר כר	SOIL	MET	Lab Number	59586	59587	59588	59589	59590	59591	59592	59593	METH	Lab Number	59586	59587	59588	59589	59590	59591	59592	59593

Page 1 of 2 08/26/2008 10:59 am Explanations of soil analysis terms are available upon request Have Bale Samples are retained 30 days after report of analysis Hans Burken Agronomist Reviewed and Approved By: Analyses are representative of the samples submitted

 Samples are retained 30 days after report of analysis
 Explanations of soil analysis terms are available upon request

 Reviewed and
 Hans Burken
 Anno Bod

 Approved By:
 Agronomist
 08/26/2008 10:59 am

Analyses are representative of the samples submitted Samples Reviewed Attachment 2.05.4(2)(d)-2 Salt Tolerance of Plants Electric Conductivity (EC)

Electric Conductivity (EC) of plants.

An internet search on plant tolerance of Electric Conductivity (EC) was performed and the Alberta Canada Agriculture and Rural Development paper on Salt Tolerance of Plants study appeared. (http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/agdex3303). Within this document the author stated on page 1, Table 2 that Alfalfa, Birdsfoot Trefoil, and Bromegrass forage had a salt tolerance $EC_{ds/m}$ value of 8. Tall Wheatgrass, Russian Wildrye and Slender Wheatgrass had a salt tolerance $EC_{ds/m}$ of 16 and Crested Wheatgrass and Intermediate Wheatgrass had a Moderate ($Ec_{ds/m}=4$).

A second internet search from Colorado State University revealed the conversion between

 $EC_{\mbox{\scriptsize cds/m}}$ and $EC_{\mbox{\scriptsize SP (mmho/cm)}}$. The conversion is a 1:1. See below:

(http://www.ext.colostate.edu/PUBS/crops/00506.html)

Salt Tolerance of Plants

Page 1 of 2

Download pdf - 79K

Sign up for ou

Agriculture and Rural Development

Search

Alberta.ca > Agriculture and Rural Development

Salt Tolerance of Plants

Plant species vary in how well they tolerate salt-affected soils. Some plants will tolerate high levels of salinity while others can tolerate little or no salinity. The relative growth of plants in the presence of salinity is termed their salt tolerance.

Salt tolerances are usually given in terms of the stage of plant growth over a range of electrical conductivity (EC) levels. Electrical conductivity is the ability of a solution to transmit an electrical current. To determine soil salinity EC, an electrical current is imposed in a glass cell using two electrodes in a soil extract solution taken from the soil being measured (soil salinity). The units are usually given in deciSiemens per metre (dS/m).

Table 1 categorizes salinity into general ranges from non- saline to very strongly saline. These values are used for plant selection for saline soils. Salinity levels vary widely across a saline seep. Salinity also varies from spring to fall. Salinity usually appears on the soil surface just after spring thaw.

A high salt level interferes with the germination of new seeds. Salinity acts like drought on plants, preventing roots from performing their osmotic activity where water and nutrients move from an area of low concentration into an area of high concentration. Therefore, because of the salt levels in the soil, water and nutrients cannot move into the plant roots.

As soil salinity levels increase, the stress on germinating seedlings also increases. Perennial plants seem to handle salinity better than annual plants. In some cases, salinity also has a toxic effect on plants because of the high concentration of certain salts in the soil. Salinity prevents the plants from taking up the proper balance of nutrients they require for healthy growth.

Extensive research on salt tolerance for prairie conditions was done in 1988 (Table 2). It should be noted that crop tolerances developed for chloride-dominated soils, such as those in California, may not be applicable to crops grown on the sulphate-dominated soils typically found in western Canada.

Table 1. Salinity rating and elect	trical conductivity value				
Soil Depth	Non-Saline	Weakly Saline	Moderately Saline	Strongly Saline	Very Strongly Saline
0-60 cm (0-2 ft)	<2 ds/m*	2-4 ds/m	4-8 ds/m	8-16 ds/m	>16 ds/m
60-120 cm(2-4 ft)	<1 de/m	1.8 ds/m	8 16 ds/m	16.24 ds/m	>24 da/m

* ds/m = decisiemens per metre.

The dominant salts in prairie saline seeps are calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg), sodium (Na) cations and sulfate (SO4) anions. If Na levels are high or not balanced with the Ca and Mg, soil tilth can also be effected. The positively charged Na cations attach to the negatively charged clay particles in the soil, causing the soil to be sticky when wet, and hard and impermeable when dry.

Table 2 gives salinity tolerance ratings for a range of plant species and a range of salinity levels. New research underway may modify the rating of some plant types. As a general rule, plants that have low drought tolerance will have low salinity tolerance.

Salt Tolerance EC (ds/m) Field Crops		Forages	Vegetables	Trees, Shrubs		
		beardless wildrye	· · ·			
Very High		fulks altai grass				
20		levonns alkaligrass				
		alkali sucatan				
ligh	kochia	altai wildrye		Siberian salt tree		
6	sugar beets	tall wheatgrass		sea buckthorn		
	-	Russian wildrye		silver buffaloberry		
et al an an		slender wheat grass		-		
3	6-row barley	birdsfoot trefoil	garden beets	hawthorn		
	safflower	sweetclover	asparagus	Russian olive		
	sunflower	alfalfa	spinach	American elm		
	2-row barley	bromegrass		Siberian elm		
	fall rye			villosa lilac		
	winter wheat			laurel leaf willow		
	spring wheat			_		
Moderate	oats	crested wheatgrass	tomatoes	spreading juniper		
	yellow mustard	intermediate wheatgrass	broccoli	poplar		
	meadow fescue	reed canary grass	cabbage	ponderosa pine		
	flax			apple		

http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/agdex3303

10/23/2008

A third internet search revealed a document from Colorado University that lists some trees, shrubs, flowers, grasses and other ground cover vegetation that have different salt tolerance (EC). Alfalfa, and some species of grasses WFC plants are in in this list. (www.coopext.coloradostate.edu/tra/plants/stable.html)(See the Reports below.

Gardening and Horticulture Home Page Tri River Area Colorado State University Extension

Horticulture Colorado State University Extension 2775 US Hwy 50, Grand Junction, CO. 81503 voice: 970-244-1834 fax: 970-244-1700 Comments are appreciated.

Last updated: 10/07/2008 20:26:24 W3C 4.01 SafeSurf Rated Labeled with ... G

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/contents.html

10/23/2008

Salt Tolerance of Temperate Zone Plants Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area Mesa Delt... Page 1 of 7

SALT TOLERANCE OF VARIOUS TEMPERATE ZONE ORNAMENTAL PLANTS

Prepared by:

Curtis E. Swift, Ph.D., Area Extension Agent (Horticulture) Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area

An Introduction to Salts Publications Available from Colorado State University

The Plant List

- Trees
 - Deciduous
 - o Coniferous
- Shrubs
- Vines
- Flowers
- Grasses and other ground covers

References Used

An Introduction

Soluble salts can cause harm to plants if they are in high enough concentration in water or soil. This effect is mainly indirect by pulling moisture out of roots and reducing the uptake of water and nutrients to affected plants. Some salts can be toxic to root tissue. Tip and edge burn of leaves, slow growth, nutrient deficiencies, wilting and eventual death of the plant can occur if the salt level is excessive for the plant and the problem is not corrected. To avoid plant loss in salty sites, a **soil test** should be done to determine the soil salt level and plants selected based on their salt tolerance.

Soil testing laboratories will report the salinity (conductivity) of soil in decisiemens per meter (dS/m) (equivalent to the old measure of millimhos per centimeter). The salinity of irrigation water is typically reported in micromhos per centimeter (umhos/cm) or microsiemens per meter (uS/m).

Conductivity is defined as the ability of a solution to conduct an electrical current, or the reciprocal of the solution's ability to resist the current. This current is conducted by electrically charged particles called ions, which are present in almost all solutions. Different solutions have different kinds and amounts of ions: distilled water has very few ions, and therefore a low conductivity, while sea water has a large number of ions, and a high conductivity. The greater the conductivity of the solution the higher the reading.

Publications Available Elsewhere

The following references on salts are available from the Colorado State University Publications on Line Site:

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/stable.html

10/23/2008

Salt Tolerance of Temperate Zone Plants Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area Mesa Delt... Page 2 of 7

- 1. Salt-affected soils an explanation of saline, sodic and saline-sodic soils and their treatment
- 2. Management of salt- and sodium-affected soils covers problem diagnosis, reclamation treatments and prevention and control
- 3. Crop tolerance to soil salinity provides some data on the salt tolerance of field, forage, vegetable and fruit crops
- 4. Irrigation water quality criteria explains the four basic criteria for evaluating water quality for irrigation purposes salinity and sodium hazard, toxic elements and bicarbonate concentration
- 5. **Growing turf on salt-affected (alkali) sites -** provides information on the salt tolerance of various cool-season grasses used for turf and provides information on which turf grasses to choose based on the salt level in the soil. How to reduce the salt level in the soil is also discussed.

To access these publications contact the Colorado State University Extension <u>Web site</u>. To read some of these publications you will need to download Acrobat Reader. A link to Acrobat Reader is provided from CSU's site. If you live in Colorado these publications are available from any <u>CSU Extension office</u>.

The Plant List

The following information was gleaned from various publications and personal experiences of nurseryman in Western Colorado's Tri River Area and is suggested as a guide when recommending trees, shrubs, vines and herbaceous plants for salty sites. Information regarding other temperate zone plants and their salt tolerance would be appreciated. Please send comments and additional references to cswift@coop.ext.colostate.edu

Trees and their salt tolerances **Deciduous Trees**

High Tolerance - up to 8 mmhos(mS)

Acer plantanoides - Norway Maple Aesculus hippocastanum Common Horsechestnut Ailanthus altissima - Tree of Heaven Amelanchier canadensis - Shadblow Crataegus crus-galli - Cockspur Hawthorn Elaeagnus angustifolia - Russian Olive - possibly up to 10 mmhos Gleditsia triacanthos - Honeylocust Quercus alba - White Oak Quercus robur - English Oak Quercus rubra - Red oak Robinia pseudoacacia - Black Locust Ptelea trifoliata - Wafer Ash

Moderately High Tolerance - up to 6 mmhos

Acer negundo - Box-elder Acer ginnala - Amur maple Betula lenta - Sweet Birch Betula apopulifolia - Grey Birch Betula alleghaniensis - Yellow Birch Betula papyrifera - Paper Birch Fraxinus americana - White Ash Populus alba - White Poplar Populus deltoides - Eastern Cottonwood Populus grandidentata - Large-toothed Aspen Populus nigra - Lombardy Poplar

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/stable.html

10/23/2008

Salt Tolerance of Temperate Zone Plants Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area Mesa Delt... Page 3 of 7

Populus tremuloides - Trembling (Quaking) Aspen Prunus padus - European Bird Cherry Prunus serotina - Black Cherry Prunus virginiana - Choke Cherry Salix alba `Tristis' - Golden Weeping Willow Salix alba `Vitellina' - Golden Willow Salix nigra - Black Willow Sophora japonica - Japanese Pagoda Tree Ulmus pumila - Siberian Elm

Moderate Tolerance - up to 4 mmhos

Catalpa speciosa - Northern Catalpa Celtis occidentalis - Hackberry Celtis reticulata - Netleaf hackberry Cercis occidentalis - Western Redbud Fraxinus anomala - Singleleaf Ash Fraxinus excelsior - European Ash Fraxinus pennsylvanica - Green Ash Ginkgo biloba - Maindenhair Tree Koelreuteria paniculata - Goldenrain Tree Maclura pomifera - Osage-Orange Pyrus species - Pear Ulmus americana - American Elm

<u>Slight Tolerance - up to 2 mmhos</u> *Quercus palustris* - Pin Oak *Malus* species and cultivars - Apple and Crabapple

Sensitive or Intolerant

Acer rubrum - Red Maple Acer saccharinum - Silver Maple Acer saccharum - Sugar Maple Cercis canadensis - Eastern Redbud Juglans nigra - Black Walnut Plantanus acerifolia - London Plane Sorbus aucuparia - European Mountain-Ash Tilia americana - American Iinden Tilia cordata - Littleleaf Linden

Coniferous Trees

High Tolerance - up to 8 mmhos

Juniperus chinensis - Pfitzer juniper Picea glauca ` densata' - Black Hills Spruce Pinus mugo - Mugho Pine Pinus nigra - Austrian Pine

Moderately High Tolerance - up to 6 mmhos

Pinus ponderosa - Ponderosa Pine *Pinus thunbergiana* - Japanese Black Pine *Thuja occidentalis* - American Arborvitae

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/stable.html

10/23/2008

Salt Tolerance of Temperate Zone Plants Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area Mesa Delt... Page 4 of 7

Slight Tolerance - up to 2 mmhos

Picea albies - Norway Spruce Pinus strobus - Eastern White Pine Pinus sylvestris - Scot's Pine Pseudotsuga menziesii - Douglas Fir Taxus cuspidata - Japanese Yew

Sensitive or Intolerant

Abies balsamea - Balsam Fir *Pinus resinosa* - Red or Norway Pine *Tsuga canadensis* - Canadian Hemlock

Shrubs and their salt tolerances

Very High Tolerance - Up to 10 mmhos Atriplex canescens - Fourwing Saltbush Atriplex convertifolia - Shadscale Saltbush Atriplex corrugata - Mat Saltbush Atriplex nuttalli - Nuttall Saltbush Atriplex nuttalli cuneata - Castle Valey Clover Atriplex nuttalli gardneri - Gardner Saltbush Baccharis emoryi - Emory Baccharis Baccharis glutinosa - Seep-Willow Ceratoides Ianata - Common Winterfat Chrysothamnus greenei - Greene Rabbitbrush Chrysothamnus linifolius - Flaxleaf Rabbitbrush Ephedra species - Mormon Teas Ephedra torreyana - Torrey Ephedra Kochia americana - Greenmolly Summercypruss Sarcobatus vermiculatus - Black Greasewood Tamarix pentandra - Five-Stamen Tamarix, Tamarisk

High Salt Tolerance - up to 8 mmhos

Caragana arborescens - Siberian Peashrub Chrysothamnus albidus - Alkali Rabbitbrush Cytisus scoparius - Scotch Broom Elaeagnus commutata - Silverberry Elaeagnus multiflora - Cherry Elaeagnus Euonymous japonica - Spindle Tree Halimodendron halodendron - Salt-tree Hippophae rhamnoides - Sea Buckthorn Juniperus chinensis - Pfitzer Juniper Lonicera tatarica - Tararian honevsuckel Rhamnus cathartica - Common Buckthorn Rhus trilobata - Squawbush Rhus typhina - Staghorn Sumac Rhamnus frangula - Glossy Buckthorn Shepherdia canadensia - Buffaloberry Spiraea vanhouttei - Van Houtte Spirea Symphoricarpuos albus - Snowberry Syringa amurensis japonica - Japanese Tree Lilac Syringa vulgaris - Common Lilac Potentilla fruiticosa `Jackmanii' - Jackman's potentilla Tamarix gallica - Manna Plant - Tamarisk

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/stable.html

10/23/2008

Salt Tolerance of Temperate Zone Plants Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area Mesa Delt... Page 5 of 7

Moderately High Tolerance - up to 6 mmhos

Artemisia frigida - Fringed Sagewort Artemisia spinescens - Bud Sagebrush Artemisia tridentata - Basin Big Sagebrush Buxus microphylla - Japanese Boxwood Chrvsothamnus nauseosus - Rubber Rabbitbrush Chrysothamnus visci diflorus - Douglas Rabbitbrush Ephedra nevadensis - Nevada Mormontea Forsythia x intermedia - Showy Border Forsythia Juniperus communis - Common Juniper Philadelphus coronarius - Sweet Mockorange Purshia glandulsa - Desert Bitterbrush Pyracantha fortuneana - Pyracantha Rhus glabra - Smooth Sumac Rhus trilobata - Skunkbush Sumac - Three-leaf Sumac Shepherdia rotundifolia - Roundleaf Buffaloberry Spirea `Froebel's' - Froebel's spirea

Slight to Moderate - up to 4 mmhos

Artemisia cana - Silver Sagebrush Berberis fremontii - Fremont Barberry Robinia neo-mexicana - New Mexican Locust Rosa woodsii - Wood's Rose Salix exigua - Coyote Willow

Slight Tolerance - up to 2 mmhos

Chaenomeles speciosa - Flowering Quince Ligustrum vulgare - Common Privet Rosa rugosa - Rugosa Rose - may be slightly tolerant Viburnum opulus - High Bush Cranberry

Sensitive or Intolerant

Cornus racemosa - Grey Dogwood *Cornus stolonifera* - Red-osier dogwood *Rosa* - Rose

Vines and their salt tolerances

High Tolerance - up to 8 mmhos

Lonicera tataricum `Zabelii' - Zabel's Honeysuckle Parthenocissus quinquefolia - Virginia Creeper - Woodbine

Slight Tolerance - up to 4 mmhos

Lonicera japonica - Japanese Hall's Honeysuckle

Flowers and their salt tolerances

High to Moderate - 6 to 8 mmhos

Aquilegia micrantha - Cliff Columbine Machaeranthera xylorrhiza - Common Woody Aster Psilostrophe bakerii - Paperflower Stanley pinnata - Prince's Plume - a good indication that the soil is high in selenium

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/stable.html

10/23/2008

Salt Tolerance of Temperate Zone Plants Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area Mesa Delt... Page 6 of 7

Moderate Salt Tolerance - 4 to 6 mmhos

Fallugia paradoxa - Common Apache Oenothera caespitosa - Tufted Evening Primrose Sphaeralcea coccinea - Scarlet Globemallow Yucca elata Soaptree - Yucca Yucca glauca - Small Soapweed

Slightly Tolerant - 2 to 4 mmhos

Argemone species - Prickly Poppies Calochorutus species - Mariposa Lilly Chyrsopsis villosa - Hairy Goldenaster Gallardia pennatifida - Cutleaf Blanketflower Mentzelia species - Blazing Stars Physaria australus - Twinpod

Grasses and other Ground Covers and their salt tolerances

High tolerance - 14 to 18 mmhos

Agropyron elongatum - Tall Wheatgrass Agropyron smithii - Western Wheatgrass Distichlis - Saltgrass Elymus triticoides - Beardless wildrye Lotus corniculatus = Birdsfoot trefoil - a legume Puccinellia - alkaligrass Sporobolus airoides - Alkali sacaton

Moderately High - 12 to 8 mmhos

Bromus marginatus - Mountain brome Lolium perenne - Perennial ryegrass Melilotus alba - White sweet clover Melilotus officinalis - Yellow sweet clover Trifolium fragiferum - Strawberry clover

Moderate - 8 to 4 mmhos

Agropyron cristatum - Crested Wheatgrass Agropyron riparium - Streambank Wheatgrass Agropyron trachycaulum - Slender Wheatgrass Arrhenatherum elatium - Tall meadow oatgrass Bromus inermis - Smooth brome Buchloe dactyloides - Buffalograss Dactylis glomerata - Orchardgrass Elymus giganteus - Mammoth wildrye Elymus junceus - Russian wildrye Festuca arundinacea - Tall Fescue Medicago sativa - Alfalfa Phalaris arundinacea - Reed Canarygrass

Low salt Tolerance

Alopecurus pratensis - Meadow foxtail Festuca rubra - Red fescue Festuca elatior - Meadow fescue Poa pratensis - Kentucky Bluegrass Trifolium pratense - Red clover

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/stable.html

10/23/2008

Salt Tolerance of Temperate Zone Plants Colorado State University Extension Tri River Area Mesa Delt... Page 7 of 7 Trifolium repens - White clover

References Used

Beckerson, D. W.; Nancy Cain; Dr. Gerry Hofstra; D.P. Ormrod; and Patricia Cambell. 1980. - `A Guide to: Plant Sensitivity to Environmental Stress' Landscape Archtecture May. pp. 299 - 303 Farnham, D.S. 1979. Water Quality Affects Ornamental Plant Production. University of California, Leaflet 2995 Feucht, J.R. Trees and shrubs for High Alkalline and High Salt Conditions - Extension Service, Tri River Area, Colorado State University Kearney, T. 1924. The Choice of Crops for alkali Lands. USDA, Farmers' Bulletin No. 446 Kvaalen, R. 1979. Roadside De-Icing salts and Ornamental Plants. Yard and Garden- Horticulture Department Extension Service, Purdue, Indiana Miller, W. M. 1956 irrigatin Water Quality; Crop Tolerances. Agricultural Engineering. S.W. Rich, A. E 1972.. Effects of salt on Eastern Highway Trees. American Nurseryman 135:36-39, Sucoff, E. 1975. Effects of deicing salts on woody vegetation along Minnesota roads - Technical bulletin 303 - Foresty Service Minnesota Agricultural Station Thornburg, A.A. 1982. Plant materials for Use on Surface-Mined Lands in Arid and Semiarid Regions. **USDA- Soil Conservation Service** USDA, Some trees more tolerant to Salt - Grounds Maintenance, October 1983, Page 8 Weichuding, P.J. 1978. Minimizing salt Injury to Shade Trees - Minnesota Tree Lilne, Agricultural Extension Service, University of Minnesota Publication No 19

to the Soils of Western Colorado Home Page

Placed on the Internet April 13, 1997

Comments should be addressed to <u>Dr. Curtis E. Swift</u>, Area Extension Agent, Horticulture Colorado State Extension 2775 US Hwy 50, Grand Junction, CO. 81503 voice: 970-244-1834 fax: 970-244-1700

W3C 4.01

http://www.coopext.colostate.edu/TRA/PLANTS/stable.html

10/23/2008