

0010



Norman H. Bangerter
Governor
Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

April 17, 1989

TO: Richard V. Smith, Acting Permit Supervisor
FROM: Tom Munson, Reclamation Hydrologist *RUS for TM*
RE: Huntington #4 Field Revision of Drainage Plans, Beaver
Creek Coal Company, Huntington #4 Mine, ACT/015/004-88C,
Folder #2, Emery County, Utah

Synopsis

A field amendment was approved and the information inserted into the PAP on January 2, 1989. A field visit was carried out by Tom Munson and Darin Worden on April 13, 1989, to inspect Huntington No. 4 Mine. This memo discusses the outcome of this site visit.

Analysis

On December 28, 1988, Mr. Bill Malencik, Division Inspector, wrote a memo to Mr. John Whitehead, describing maintenance work and the construction of a 600-foot long ditch and minor regrading work. It was approved by John Whitehead and Plate 3-8 was inserted in the PAP on January 2, 1989.

It is felt the operator has failed to supply the necessary calculations documenting standard engineering designs used to size this diversion. Based on the field inspection, it was determined that the operator has captured enough drainage area in this diversion to potentially cause significant erosion, should a major event be seen at the site.

Page 2
Memo to R. Smith
ACT/015/004-88C
April 17, 1989

Recommendation

The operator should have been required to submit the appropriate engineering calculations. The Division has provided what it feels is the peak flow and resultant velocity (see attached calculation sheets) for this ditch. The operator is liable for erosion protection in this ditch based on these numbers. Riprap and small gabion structures are currently in place but will provide, at best, marginal erosion protection. Therefore, it is the Division's opinion that this diversion has not been adequately installed with the appropriate erosion protection based on five feet per second being considered an erosive velocity.

Due to access to the reclaimed site and potential damage to reclaimed areas, the Division will monitor the diversion until the end of the 1989 runoff session (i.e. October 1989) to determine if additional protection is necessary. At that time a determination and, if necessary, recommendation will be made regarding the need for additional erosion protection.

djh
AT5/33-34