



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Ted Stewart
Executive Director

James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

June 21, 1994

Jay Marshall, Chief Engineer
Genwal Coal Company
P.O. Box 1420
Huntington, UT 84528

Re: Five-Year Renewal Submittal, Wellington Preparation Plant, Nevada Electric Investment Company, ACT/007/012, Folder #2, Carbon County, Utah

Dear Mr. Marshall:

This letter is to remind you that the five-year renewal application must be submitted to the Division by August 10, 1994. Pursuant to R645-303-232, this application must include at a minimum: a) Evidence that liability insurance is provided, b) evidence that the performance bond is in effect for the operation and will continue in full force and effect for any renewal request, and c) a copy of the proposed newspaper notice for the renewal as required by R645-300-121.100.

If you have any questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Pamela Grubbaugh-Littig".

Pamela Grubbaugh-Littig
Permit Supervisor

The site visit was arranged during the meeting for September 15, 1994. Also during the meeting, it was decided that the proposed silt fence installations for ASCA #2 and #3 were needed for either interpretation and Mr. Johnson requested that the silt fence be installed prior to the field visit.

Based upon the verbal direction received in the September 8th meeting, Castle Valley Resources installed the requested silt fence across drainages in ASCA #2 and #3.

During the field visit on September 15, an attempt was made to define revisions to the onsite ASCA problems which would be consistent with both the existing directive and proposed modifications. The following is our understanding of what will be acceptable modifications in the submittal.

- ASCA #1** - No change.
- ASCA #2** - Amend plan to include the silt fence installed across the drainage way.
- ASCA #3** - Design a berm downstream (south-east) of the coarse refuse pile to direct runoff to a silt fence. The combination of the berm and silt fence will provide alternate sediment control for the south facing and east facing refuse pile embankments as well as the top soil stockpile located adjacent to the south west corner of the refuse pile. Amend the plan to include the silt fence installed across the drainageways at the southeast end of the ASCA.
- ASCA #4** - This is a road. Remove the ASCA designation from the plan and discuss this road in the roadway section of the MRP.
- ASCA #5** - Provide minimum design cross section for the existing berm to convey the 10-year 6-hour storm event peak to the silt fence. Provide design volume based on the 10-year 24-hour storm event for the existing depression located southwest of the pump station house.
- ASCA #6** - No change.
- ASCA #7** - No change.

Other Areas - Pipeline berm located south of Clearwater Pond embankment: The pipelines cross the area between the county road and the Clearwater Pond embankment on top of a berm (see Drawing No. F9-177 Sheet 2). The top of the berm is not vegetated. The areas on both sides of the berm are very well vegetated with red top grass, salt grass, and some common read grass. Any sediments from the pipeline berm would be dropped out immediately adjacent to the pipeline berm in the vegetation. Concurrence was not reached as to how best to include this area in an amendment. Research is needed for the

September 16, 1994
Page Three

following questions: Is the area within the disturbed area? Would an SAE using a demonstration (e.g. SEDCAD of the adequacy of the vegetative filter meet regulations? All attendees to the September 15 field visit concurred that the pipeline berm does not represent a threat to downstream turbidity and that the problem is a paper problem in fitting into the regulations.

Mid-term permit revisions submitted to the Division during the last year have now been accepted with a few outstanding deficiencies and we have been asked to provide copies of the revisions for insertion into the Wellington MRP. We are scheduled to provide the requested copies of the revisions along with responses to the deficiencies by November 11, 1994.

We believe that we have diligently strove to meet the verbal request that an ASCA amendment be submitted within 30 days of Mr. Demczak's visit, however, because of delays expressed with directive interpretation (disagreements among DOGM staff), time required to coordinate the necessary meetings, and remaining research needed; we request that we be allowed to submit the ASCA amendment along with the other responses to be submitted November 11.

Sincerely,



R. Jay Marshall
Chief Engineer

cc: Mr. Steve Johnson, DOGM
Mr. Steve Demczak, DOGM
Mr. Daron Haddock, DOGM
Mr. Patrick Collins, Mt. Nebo Scientific
Mr. Greg Poole, HA&L