

0002



# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangarter

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 20, 1992

Mr. J. T. Paluso, Chief Engineer  
Soldier Creek Coal Company  
P. O. Box I  
Price, Utah 84501

Dear Mr. Paluso:

Re: Approval of Pond As-Builts, Soldier Creek Coal Company, Soldier Canyon Mine, ACT/007/018-91F, Folder #3, Carbon County, Utah

The submittal received on December 12, 1991 regarding the above noted permitting action was reviewed and found to be complete and adequate by Sharon Falvey, Reclamation Hydrologist, of the Division's technical staff. Please review the enclosed technical memo. The submittal was in response to stipulation R645 (614)- 301-733.(1)-SKF, required by the July 19, 1991 permit revision.

The Division hereby approves the above referenced action. Please submit ten (10) copies of the submittal by December 18, 1992 for distribution to other agencies. Thank you for your cooperation in resolving this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Daron R. Haddock".

Daron R. Haddock  
Permit Supervisor

cc: S. Falvey  
S. Demczak, PFO  
APPPOND.SC3



# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangarter  
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 19, 1992

TO: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Sharon Falvey, Reclamation Specialist *SKF*

RE: Sediment Pond Amendment 91F, Soldier Creek Coal Company, Soldier Canyon Mine, ACT/007/018, Folder #2, Carbon County, Utah

## SUMMARY:

On December 12, 1991 Soldier Creek Coal Company (SC3) submitted the certified "as built" designs required by stipulation R645(614)-301-733-(1)-SKF, required by the July 19, 1991 permit revision. A minor discrepancy in watershed information remains. However, the submitted information pertaining to Amendment 91F is recommended for approval.

I would like to inform the operator that recently submitted changes pertaining to the mine site facilities expansion in the Permit Renewal Technical Deficiency Review received at the Division on September 8, 1992 have introduced discrepancies in watershed information related to pond sizing. Deficiencies from that amendment must be clarified, and should be submitted in an amendment separate from the permit renewal deficiency response as the September 8, amendment will be recommended for denial (technical analysis forthcoming).

The discrepancies listed in the deficiency review and the applicants submittal are as follows:

## ANALYSIS:

1. Send a certified map of the pond changes.
2. Clearly describe that the pond will be passing the peak event through both spillways, describe that riprap under the spillway applies to both spillway outlets.
3. Correct discrepancy in Section 10.5.3 pg 26 indicates freeboard is at 1.08 ft. while appendix A, pg 8 indicates it is at 1.48 ft.

Page 2  
Soldier Creek Coal Company  
ACT/007/018  
November 19, 1992

4. Table 2-1 and attachment A pg. 4, and map E030 have discrepancies in watershed areas.

Proposal:

The operator has included a certified Map drawing B-127. The operator has provided a Final Construction Report, Appendix 7-A, pg. 8a. Pg. 7-116, pg. 26 Section 10.5.3, pg.7-124 have been modified.

Analysis:

The operator supplied certified drawings of pond changes. Pg. 7-116 and pg. 26 have clarified the passage of the peak event through both spillways, and the existing freeboard. Page 1-124 clarifies the placement of riprap under the spillways.

The operator did not correct discrepancies in Table 2-1 and attachment A pg. 4, and map E030 which have discrepancies in watershed areas. However, The design of the pond did use the larger acreage value for the watershed. Table 2-1 appears to be in error.

New discrepancies exist between map E030 and map E064 as submitted in the September 8, 1992 permit deficiencies. In addition the recent map submittal E064 describing the runoff controls does not distinguish between the actual disturbed areas and the limits of disturbance. As indicated in the January 28, Technical deficiency review the submitted pond designs were based on proposed disturbed areas not on the potential disturbed areas. If the Operator has disturbed additional area an amendment will need to be submitted to the Division with the revised sediment pond calculations and other pertinent information.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

I am recommending approval of the information submitted pertaining to Amendment 91F. The discrepancies in watershed information from the September 8 deficiency response will need clarification and should be submitted in an amendment separate from the permit renewal deficiency response. The operator is encouraged to meet with the Division to discuss problems with the Run-Off Control Map E064. Additional response to this issue will be included in the forth coming deficiency review memo pertaining to the February 6, 1992 Permit Renewal Response.

cc: S. Falvey, DOGM