DEQ OPENCUT MINING PROGRAM

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPLICANT: Mark and Loretta Moore **COUNTY:** Carbon

SITE NAME: Moore Spencer **DATE:** July 2011

LOCATION: Section 35, T6 S, R20 E

APPROVED PERMIT #: 1481

Type and Purpose of Action: The Operator has applied for an amendment to add 63.5 acres to their 5.1-acre permit for the purpose of expanding the mine area. Of this amended acreage, 53.3 acres would be undisturbed until bonded, and 10.2 acres would be used as additional mine area. The original 5.1 acres postmining land use would change to agricultural/industrial for farm equipment storage and a small wildlife pond. The total permitted area would be 68.6 acres. In addition, the operator name would change to Mark and Loretta Moore and the site name would change to Moore Spencer.

Site Description: The 63.5-acre proposed amendment area is an addition directly adjacent and to the west and south of the existing permitted area. The operation will continue to mine to the south. The undisturbed until bonded area to the west would remain as hayland. There are no site characteristics of special concern, or nearby residences or public use areas.

Potential Impacts and Mitigation: Use of the amendment area would not cause substantial impacts on the physical environment and human population. Proponent would be legally bound by their permit to reclaim the site to Agricultural/Industrial and Hayland by December 2028. The 2003 Environmental Assessment is applicable to this action.

Prepared By: Kenley Stone — Opencut Mining Program Environmental Specialist
Name — Title

Reviewed By: JJ Conner — Opencut Mining Program Unit Coordinator
Name — Title

PRIVATE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT ACT (PPAA) CHECKLIST

DOES THE PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION HAVE TAKINGS IMPLICATIONS UNDER THE PPAA?

YES	NO	
X		1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights?
	X	2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property?
	X	3. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?
	X	4. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership?
	X	5. Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? (If answer is NO, skip questions 5a and 5b and continue with question 6.)
		5a. Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interests?
		5b. Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property?
	X	6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property?
	X	7. Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public generally? (If the answer is NO, skip questions 7a-7c)
		7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?
		7b. Has the government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged, or flooded?
		7c. Has the government action diminished property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question?

Taking or damaging implications exist if YES is checked in response to question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if NO is checked in response to questions 5a or 5b.

If taking or damaging implications exist, the agency must comply with § 5 of the Private Property Assessment Act, to include the preparation of a taking or damaging impact assessment. Normally, the preparation of an impact assessment will require consultation with agency legal staff.

6/17/11

EIVED
20 2011
IEMB