



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

77
Scott M. Matheson, Governor
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

July 26, 1984

TO: Memo to Coal File

FROM: Tom Suchoski, Reclamation Hydrologist *TS*

RE: Belina Mine - NOV Abatement - Valley Camp of Utah -
ACT/007/001 - Carbon County, Utah

On July 16, 1984 Tom Suchoski, Reclamation Hydrologist of the Division Staff called Mr. Trevor Whiteside, Chief Engineer for Valley Camp of Utah. This call was in response to questions raised by Mr. Whiteside, to D. Wayne Hedberg of the Division staff earlier that day. The questions dealt with two letters from the Division (sent July 6, 1984 and received by Valley Camp July 9, 1984).

The first letter requested that Valley Camp demonstrate that the rechannalization of Eccles Creek is able to handle the peakflow from the 100 year-24 hour storm as required by UMC 817.44(B). Mr. Whiteside indicated that he didn't know how to address this request. Mr. Suchoski indicated that if the peakflow from the required storm had been estimated for the culvert 200 ft up stream from the diversion this could be used. The continuity equation and Manning's equation could then be used to determine the channel capacity for the sections between the fish ladder drop structures. Mr. Whiteside was unfamiliar with these equations and indicated that he would probably have to go to a consultant to address the concerns of the letter.

The second letter dealt with sediment pond #4 on the Belina Mine Pad. As history the following is presented, Mr. Ken Wyatt had issued a violation on May 30, 1984 for failure to meet effluent limitations. On June 19, 1984 Valley Camp submitted a plan to clean out the No. 4 sediment pond. In this plan they indicated that by cleaning the pond they felt the effluent limitations could be met. This plan addresses some of the concerns of the violation remedial action requirements. The Division's technical staff, however, feels that the plan would not be acceptable as a long-term solution to the problem.

The major concern to the technical staff is that Sediment Pond No. 4 is being operated in a manner that is inconsistent with the operational design. It is felt that this is the reason that the pond is not capable of long term compliance with effluent limitations.

Presently excess mine water is being discharged into the pond. having no dewatering structure and little evaporation, the total storage capacity of the pond has quickly been reached. As a result, the pond is not capable of storing the 10 year-24 hour runoff. When a 10 year-24 hour or less storm occurs the runoff water enters the pond and agitates the mine water in the pond. This agitated water is displaced and flows through the principal spillway to be discharged to Whiskey Creek. The staff feels that such an occurrence would lead to significant exceedances of effluent limitations.

Cleaning the pond would increase the detention time of the excess mine water, thereby helping to meet effluent limitations. However, agitation of the ponded water following runoff entering the pond would minimize this advantage.

Mr. Whiteside did not feel Valley Camp had a problem. He felt that the pond would have sufficient storage if it were cleaned and saw no problem with spilling water standing in the pond if runoff entered the pond.

Mr. Suchoski indicated that he could not agree and suggested that Mr. Whiteside demonstrate his position or contact Mr's. Smith, Daniels, Helfrich or Wyatt and ask for their thoughts or positions. Mr. Whiteside indicated that he would take the later action.

TJS/jvb
96970