

0013



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

April 16, 1990

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
P 074 978 665

Mr. Allen Childs
Genwal Coal Company, Incorporated
P. O. Box 1201
Huntington, Utah 84528

Dear Mr. Childs:

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N90-27-3-1, ACT/007/012, Folder #5, Carbon County, Utah

The undersigned has been appointed by the Board of Oil, Gas and Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under UMC/SMC 845.11-845.17.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced violation. This violation was issued by Division Inspector, Harold Sandbeck on March 14, 1990. Rule UMC/SMC 845.2 et seq. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Notice of Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.

Within fifteen (15) days after receipt of this proposed assessment, you or your agent may file a written request for an assessment conference to review the proposed penalty. The detailed brief should indicate the specific objections to the proposed assessment, stating the grounds for objection and what your assignment of points would be. (Submit a request for conference to Vicki Bailey, at the above address. Please reference Permit and NOV #).

If a timely request is not made, the proposed penalty(ies) will become final, and the penalty(ies) will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the proposed assessment. Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Vicki Bailey.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joseph C. Helfrich".

Joseph C. Helfrich
Assessment Officer

jb
Enclosure
MN36/41

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES
UTAH DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

COMPANY/MINE Genwal Coal Co/Wellington Prep Plant NOV #90-27-3-1

PERMIT # ACT/007/012

VIOLATION 1 OF 1

ASSESSMENT DATE 4/16/90 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joseph C. Helfrich

I. HISTORY MAX 25 PTS

A. Are there previous violations which are not pending or vacated, which fall within 1 year of today's date?

ASSESSMENT DATE 4/16/90 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 4/16/89

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

1 point for each past violation, up to one year
5 points for each past violation in a CO, up to one year
No pending notices shall be counted

TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0

II. SERIOUSNESS (either A or B)

NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following applies. Based on the facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within which category the violation falls. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the AO will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is this an Event (A) or Hindrance (B) violation? Hindrance

A. Event Violations MAX 45 PTS

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent? _____

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent? _____

PROBABILITY	RANGE
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25*

*In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

1. Is this a potential or actual hindrance to enforcement? Actual

RANGE 0 - 25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS 15

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Failing to monitor oil and grease and solids during 3rd quarter of '89 Station SW-1 would actually hinder the inspector and/or DOMG staff from evaluating any potential environmental impacts as a result of mining; thus 15 points assigned.

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A OR B) 15

III. NEGLIGENCE MAX 30 PTS

- A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO - NO NEGLIGENCE;
- OR Was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference, lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, or the failure to abate any violation due to the same? IF SO - NEGLIGENCE;
- OR Was this violation the result of reckless, knowing, or intentional conduct? IF SO - GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence	0
Negligence	1-15
Greater Degree of Fault	16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Ordinary Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Lack of diligence with respect to compliance with DOMG regulations.

HYDROLOGY AND SEDIMENTOLOGY MANUAL

Prepared for

Office of Surface Mining, Region V

Denver, Colorado

Contract No: J7000584

Technical Project Officer: John Nadolski

BY

J.F. SATO AND ASSOCIATES

Ginger K. Sunday

James F. Sato

Helen M. Weagraff

SIMONS, LI & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Kenneth G. Eggert

Ruh-Ming Li

James D. Schall

Mark R. Peterson

Wen-Sheng Liang

SHEPHERD WATER GEOLOGISTS

Russell G. Shepherd

Table 2.16. Runoff Curve Numbers (CN) for Hydrologic Soil - Cover Complexes¹

Land use or cover	Treat- ment or practice ⁴	Hydrologic condition for infiltrating	Hydrologic soil group			
			A	B	C	D
I. Agricultural Use (from USBR, 1977)						
Fallow.....	SR		77	86	91	94
Row crops.....	SR	Poor.....	72	81	88	91
	SR-	Good.....	67	78	85	89
	C	Poor.....	70	79	84	88
	C	Good.....	65	75	82	86
	C&T	Poor.....	66	74	80	82
	C&T	Good.....	62	71	78	81
Small grain.....	SR	Poor.....	65	76	84	88
	SR	Good.....	63	75	83	87
	C	Poor.....	63	74	82	85
	C	Good.....	61	73	81	84
	C&T	Poor.....	61	72	79	82
	C&T	Good.....	59	70	78	81
Close-seeded legumes ² or rotation meadow.	SR	Poor.....	66	77	85	89
	SR	Good.....	58	72	81	85
	C	Poor.....	64	75	83	85
	C	Good.....	55	69	78	83
	C&T	Poor.....	63	73	80	83
	C&T	Good.....	51	67	76	80
Pasture or range.....		Poor.....	68	79	86	89
		Fair.....	49	69	79	84
		Good.....	39	61	74	80
	C	Poor.....	47	67	81	88
	C	Fair.....	25	59	75	83
	C	Good.....	6	35	70	79
Meadow (permanent)		do.....	30	58	71	78
Woods (farm woodlots)		Poor.....	45	66	77	83
		Fair.....	36	60	73	79
		Good.....	25	55	70	77
Farmsteads.....			59	74	82	86
Roads (dirt) ³ (hard surface) ³			72	82	87	89
			74	84	90	92
II. Surface Mine Use (OSM, 1981)						
Surface facilities						
Paved.....			98	98	98	98
Gravel.....			76	85	89	91
Dirt.....			72	82	87	89
Disturbed area (active mining).....			72	81	88	91
Reclaimed spoil (with vegetated cover)			39-	61-	74-	80-
			72	81	88	91

Notes:

1. These CN values are for antecedent moisture condition II (AMC-II). To find the proper CN for AMC-III or AMC-I, use the CN from this table in Table.
2. Close-drilled or brood cast.
3. Including right-of-way.

ESTIMATED RETURN PERIODS FOR SHORT DURATION PRECIPITATION
(inches)

Station: Price
Latitude: 39° 37'

Elevation: 5680
Longitude: 110° 50'

D U R A T I O N

RETURN PERIOD (years)	5	10	15	30	1	2	3	6	12	24
	Min	Min	Min	Min	Hr	Hr	Hr	Hr	Hr	Hr
1	.08	.13	.17	.23	.29	.37	.44	.62	.78	.95
2	.12	.18	.23	.32	.40	.49	.58	.80	1.00	1.20
5	.16	.25	.32	.44	.56	.68	.79	1.07	1.32	1.58
10	.20	.31	.39	.54	.68	.81	.94	1.25	1.53	1.82
25	.24	.37	.47	.65	.82	.98	1.13	1.50	1.83	2.18
50	.28	.43	.54	.75	.95	1.12	1.29	1.71	2.08	2.47
100	.31	.49	.62	.85	1.08	1.27	1.45	1.91	2.32	2.74

Station: Promontory Point (Saline)
Latitude: 41° 13'

Elevation: 4230
Longitude: 112° 29'

D U R A T I O N

RETURN PERIOD (years)	5	10	15	30	1	2	3	6	12	24
	Min	Min	Min	Min	Hr	Hr	Hr	Hr	Hr	Hr
1	.16	.24	.31	.43	.54	.57	.60	.68	.75	.82
2	.18	.27	.35	.48	.61	.67	.72	.85	.97	1.09
5	.21	.32	.40	.56	.71	.80	.89	1.11	1.31	1.51
10	.22	.34	.43	.60	.76	.88	.99	1.28	1.53	1.80
25	.26	.40	.50	.70	.88	1.03	1.17	1.53	1.85	2.18
50	.27	.42	.53	.73	.93	1.11	1.28	1.71	2.09	2.49
100	.29	.45	.57	.79	1.00	1.21	1.41	1.90	2.34	2.80

CIVIL SOFTWARE DESIGN

SEDCAD+ Version 3.0

WELLINGTON REFUSE OUTSLOPES

by

Name: mrc

Company Name: Office of Surface Mining - TIPS
File Name: C:\SEDCAD3\JUNK

Date: 09-07-1990

Civil Software Design -- SEDCAD+ Version 3.0
 Copyright (C) 1987-1990. Pamela J. Schwab. All rights reserved.

Company Name: Office of Surface Mining - TIPS
 Filename: C:\SEDCAD3\JUNK User: mrc
 Date: 09-07-1990 Time: 08:41:15
 WELLINGTON REFUSE OUTSLOPES
 Storm: 1.91 inches, 100 year- 6 hour, SCS 6 Hour
 Hydrograph Convolution Interval: 0.1 hr

=====
 SUBWATERSHED/STRUCTURE INPUT/OUTPUT TABLE
 =====

-Hydrology-

JBS	SWS	Area (ac)	CN	UHS	Tc (hrs)	K (hrs)	X	Base- Flow (cfs)	Runoff Volume (ac-ft)	Peak Discharge (cfs)
111	1	0.96	41	M	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.0	0.00	0.00
		Type: Null		Label: WELLINGTON REFUSE OUTSLOPES						
111	Structure	0.96							0.00	
111	Total IN/OUT	0.96							0.00	0.00

INPUT SUMMARY

FOR W.S.: WELLINGTON REFUSE OUTSLOPES

STORM:	WATERSHED:
DISTRIBUTION =SCS TYPE 'B'	LAND SLOPE = 0.0000 PCT
PRECIP.DEPH = 1.91 IN	CURVE NUMBER = 41.00
DURATION = 6.00 HR	CHANNEL LENGTH = 0.00 FT
NUMBER OF LINES = 915	TIME OF CONC. = 0.0500 HR
	AREA = 0.96 AC
	D = 0.0067 HR

From: "PEAK" (Hawkins, Marshall)

"PEAK"

WELLINGTON REFUSE OUTSLOPES

1

RUNOFF DEPTH = 0.0000 IN
INITIAL ABSTRACTION = 2.8780 IN
PEAK FLOW = 0.00 CFS-(0.0000 IPH)
AT T = 6.10 HRS

U

0 á ááááááááá áááááááááá áááááááááá áááááááááá áááááááááá áááááááááá áááááááááá

0

TIME (Hrs.)
OUTPUT SUMMARY

7

```

-----
RUNOFF DEPTH = 0.0000 IN
INITIAL ABSTRACTION = 2.8780 IN
PEAK FLOW = 0.00 CFS ( 0.0000 IPH)
AT T = 6.10 HRS
-----

```