0020

File

March 15, 1985

TO: Coal File

FROM: Rick Summers, Reclamation Hydrologist

RE: U. S. Steel Mining, Inc., Wellington Prep Plant, ACT/007/012, Folder No. 2, Carbon County, Utah

After reviewing the operators submittal of February 11, 1985 titled "Revision No. 2", several discrepancies between this plan and the MRP were noted. Of primary concern is the reduction of plant water estimated to be released to the auxillary/road pond system in the event of a power failure. The submittal of 12-30-83 (appendix B) shows the volume required to be 160,000 gallons. This value was reduced to 65,000 gallons in the Feburary 11, 1985 submittal. The difference arises from differences in estimated water volumes to be released from the two desilter bowls in the plant. The MRP was approved assuming a drop in the desilter bowl water level would be four feet. The operator contends that such a drop would take 4-5 days to occur and that the plant would foreseeably not go uninspected by the operator for a period greater than 2 days. Therefore, the value was reduced to 1 inch or 1/12 of a foot. (Randy Watts, personal communication, March 5, 1985). The road pond has therefore been constructed with a corrsponding reduction in pond volume. The operator has been requested to submit a narrative and calculations to support this statement. Additionally, the operator was requested to resubmit the revision with specifications as to which pages they are to replace in the original ORP.

Any future problems concerning the auxillary/road pond system (i.e. insufficient volume and resultant discharge and/or overflow of ponds) should be addressed considering this reduction. At such time, the appliant should be required to rebuild the pond as originally approved in th ORP (see 12/83 submittals). Note that new road pond is constructed such that only 42% of the approved ORP volume is available. Several others concerns were asked to be clarified as follows:

1. Numerical values for various water volumes are inconsistent with original submittal (on the order of 5-20%)

2. Is the culvert from the auxillary pond to the heat dryer pond closed as shown on map E9-3433?

3. The statement on p. 2 (last sentence of item 4), of the February 11, 1985 submittal needs clarification.

4. Clarification of the direction of drainage for the ditch at the dryer pond discussed on p.5 (item 3). Does this ditch drain to or away from the pond?. The January 29, 1985 submittal states that the contours on Map E9-3433 are estimated in this area. Site inspection in 1984 implies the drainage is to the East (away from the pond).

5. Heat dryer pond capacity was previously calculated from elevation 5333.0 to 5338.0 The February 11, 1985 submittal (p. 5) shows the elevation to be 5335.0 to some value above 5336.0. These values need to be clarified and the correct values inserted throughout the plan for consistency.

jvb
0176R