



# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangerter  
Governor

Dee C. Hansen  
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.  
Division Director

355 West North Temple  
3 Triad Center, Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203  
801-538-5340

0078

December 7, 1992

Mr. Glen Zumwalt, Vice President  
Utah Fuel Company  
P. O. Box 719  
Helper, Utah 84526

Dear Mr. Zumwalt:

Re: Deficiencies in Waste Rock Diversion Designs Required under Division Order, Coastal States Energy Company, Skyline Mine, ACT/007/005-DO92E, Folder #3, Carbon County, Utah

Your submittal received on November 9, 1992, intended to satisfy Division Order #92E, has been reviewed and found to be inadequate. Please review the attached technical memo written by Rick Summers, which discusses the problems with the submittal. You are also encouraged to contact Rick to discuss possible solutions to the problems encountered.

It is realized that you will not be able to correct the deficiencies within the timeframes originally established in the Division Order, due to the time involved in Division review. You will now be required to obtain approval for the permit change by no later than January 8, 1992.

Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Daron R. Haddock  
Permit Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: R. Summers  
P. Burton  
J. Helfrich

DIVEDO92.SKY



# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangerter  
Governor

Dee C. Hansen  
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.  
Division Director

355 West North Temple  
3 Triad Center, Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203  
801-538-5340

December 3, 1992

**TO:** Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

**FROM:** Rick P. Summers, Senior Hydrologist

**RE:** Waste Rock Diversion Designs (Received 11/9/92), Utah Fuel Company, Skyline Mine, ACT/007/005, Folder #2, Carbon County, Utah

## Summary

The calculations for the peak flows used as the basis for the diversion designs have been determined to be in error. The peak flows presented in the submittal differ as much as 1/5 of the flows calculated by the Division. It appears as if the applicant used a standard methodology (TR-55), but exceeded some basic assumptions of the method. This is most obvious in the calculation of the time of concentration. For example, for diversion DU-5, the applicant calculated a  $t_c$  of 5.35 hours and a peak flow of 18.75 cfs. Division calculations resulted in a  $t_c$  of 0.4305 hours and a peak flow of 60.55 cfs. Discrepancies in flow values for smaller watersheds were not as significant.

Some diversions have high design velocities (e.g. UDD-2 and SW-10), yet no channel stability designs were submitted (riprap). The section needs to reference maps that were used to determine the watershed characteristics (area, slope), diversion locations, and diversion slopes. Division reference materials indicate a Manning's "n" value of 0.035 for an unlined diversion may be considered to be too high, an "n" value on the order of 0.025 may be more appropriate.

Due to these deficiencies, a complete review of the submittal was not conducted at this time. The operator is encouraged to contact me to discuss these problems during the preparation of a resubmittal.

## Recommendation

It is recommended that this amendment be denied pending resolution of these deficiencies.

jbe  
cc: P. Burton  
S. Demczak  
SKYDIV.RS