

Tetra Tech | Complex World. CLEAR SOLUTIONS™ 120 West Park Drive, Suite 204 | Grand Junction, CO 81505 Tel: 970.986.3566 | Fax: 970.241.3120

October 29, 2012

Mr. Travis Marshall Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining & Safety 101 South 3rd, Suite 301 Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

RECEIVED

OCT 3 1 2012 GRAND JUNCTION FIELD OFFICE DIVISION OF RECLAMATION MINING & SAFETY

Re: Gallegos Corporation Conger Harvesting Area, Permit No. M-1998-022 Bond Amount Revision

Dear Travis:

This reclamation bond amount recalculation has been reviewed. The following comments are provided for your consideration and action.

- 1. Historically, all grading of slopes has been done with an excavator only. Factors contributing to this practice are: 1) dozers cannot safely operate on 2:1 slopes which are the final approved slopes; 2) the existing slopes range from 1-1/4 to 1-1/2: 1, H:V; and the bench is to remain per item 3 below; 3) the estimate for the excavator time is comparable to the historic practice.
- 2. Based on item 1, the bond amount can be reduced by:

a.	Task 02a – Rip and Grade Rock Bench -	\$2,977.18
b.	Task 04a – Dozer Mobilization (2 trips) -	\$ 917.60
	Total	\$3,894.78

- 3. In 2001, Gallegos Corporation submitted land swap technical revision, Technical Revision No. 1 (TR-01) Second Adequacy Review which shows the bench remaining after reclamation.
- 4. The approved permit contains a provision that the access and bench road is to remain after reclamation per the landowner request, which was Robert Conger. Glenn and Diane Gallegos purchased the property a few years ago and have provided an email stating they want the road to be left per the permit. The email is attached for reference.

Based on the information included in this request, it is the belief of the undersigned that the existing reclamation bond is adequate.

Thank you for your consideration of this request of this reclamation bond reduction. Please feel free to contact the undersigned at 970-986-3566 or Mr. Frank Gutierrez @ 970 524-4322 if you have any questions regarding this request.

Sincerely, Tetra Tech

Mr. William P. Balaz Jr., PE Senior Mining and Civil Engineer

Cc: Mr. Gary Woodworth, Gallegos Corporation Mr. Frank Gutierrez, Gallegos Corporation Balaz, Bill

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Gary Woodworth <Gary.Woodworth@GallegosCorp.com> Thursday, October 11, 2012 7:23 AM Balaz, Bill Frank Gutierrez FW: quarry

Good morning Bill, does the response from Glen below give you what you need to address the areas wanting future reclamation? Please advise so we can wrap up the reply to their request. Thanks

From: glen gallegos [mailto:ghgallegos@live.com] Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2012 9:35 PM To: Gary Woodworth Subject: RE: quarry

you are correct on both points. The area inside the gate was already considered reclaimed under the old state permit. Forest service should not worry about this as it was under a different permit. The road was also something we had decided to keep. There was a plan that I thought showed all of that, including that the stone within the bounderies would be used for reclamation. Let me know if there are questions and I will be glad to come up and re-visit. Seems that the bond for re-clamation was about 5 grand and showed details of what this would cover. Again, Frank or Randy should have info on this. No big deal!! Just get some votes for me. Hope you are doing well! Call if other questions.

Glen

From: Gary.Woodworth@GallegosCorp.com To: ghgallegos@live.com Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2012 16:42:34 -0600 Subject: quarry

Hey Glen, hope all is well on the campaign front. You're probably as ready as anyone for election day to be here. Quick question as we are working with the Forest Service on various areas in the conger quarry for reclamation. Is it your desire to have the road left in place to the top of the property where we last quarried ? Or will it need reclaimed? If so, they will calculate that into future reclamation cost and if not , it can be left out of calculation. We should probably also clarify the "staging area" inside the gate, I always understood it would be left as is, is that correct?

Thanks for the help

Gary