



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

November 24, 1989

TO: Sue Linner, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Rick Summers, Reclamation Hydrologist 

RE: Wellington Preparation Plant Loadout, Conditional Approval Response, Received November 2, 1989, Genwal Coal Company, ACT/007/012, Folder #2, Carbon County, Utah.

SUMMARY:

The above referenced response to the Division's Conditional Approval of October 18, 1989, has been reviewed and found to be approvable. The operator should be advised that the application should be resubmitted in it's entirety when the construction of the project is complete. This is necessary due to the numerous field revisions required during construction.

The following is the original condition with the Division's response underscored:

Condition #1: The applicant must incorporate the items discussed between myself and Brad Paul on 10-17-89 prior to 10/25/89. These items are as follows:

1. Topsoil stockpiles must be identified as small area exemptions.

The areas are now identified on pages 39 and 40 of the application.

2. The permit must incorporate a narrative of the small area exemptions for the site, including treatment structures/measures to be used to control drainage.

The applicant has provided a description of the areas in the application. The terminology should be revised during the upcoming permit renewal to correspond with the Division's current policy (i.e. use of "alternative sediment control areas" labels).

Page 2
Wellington Prep Plant Loadout
Genwal Coal Company
ACT/007/012

3. Details of the UD-1A spreader structure to be used for energy dissipation.

Details have been provided on Plate 4067-6-9 for a 20 ft. spreader.

4. Revisions (as field checked) of the watershed for UD-1A.

Brad Paul phoned and informed me that the watershed presented in the original approval was accurate following the field check (performed in late October).

5. General editing comments: cross-sections A-A and B-B, label DD-4 on map 10, correct stream lines for accuracy, P. 39 discrepancy on refuse acres, culvert design headings.

These items have been adequately addressed.

cc: Harold Sandbeck
BT6005/174-175