



STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES & ENERGY  
Oil, Gas & Mining

Scott M. Matheson, Governor  
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director  
Cleon B. Feight, Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

July 20, 1982

Mr. Andrew C. King  
Mine Engineer  
Natomas Trail Mtn. Coal Company  
P. O. Box 551  
Orangeville, Utah 84537

RE: Request for Approval of  
Culvert Extension and  
Abatement Response to NOV  
#N82-2-4-1  
Natomas Trail Mtn. Mine  
ACT/015/009  
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. King:

The Division has reviewed your latest submission of information pertaining to abatement action for NOV #N82-2-4-1. The request for approval of this modification to the previously approved culverting project cannot be granted at this time. The following deficiencies will need to be addressed before this request can be processed further:

1. Has Utah Power & Light been contacted and the necessary consents or right-of-ways been granted or requested concerning this extension?
2. Does the modification include the utilization of any State or Federal lands?
3. Have plans been submitted to any other State or Federal agencies having authority or jurisdiction over the modification (i.e., OSM, USFS, State Health, Division of Water Rights, etc.)? Has an application to alter a natural stream channel been applied for with the State Engineer's Office?
4. Is an Army Corps of Engineers, 404 permit required and/or been obtained?
5. Will the county road be altered in any way? If so, have the local authorities been contacted?
6. Has the Department of State Health, Bureau of Water Pollution Control been contacted in regard to acquisition of a variance to effluent standards during construction activities. A plan depicting BACT

Mr. Andrew C. King  
ACT/015/009  
July 20, 1982  
Page 2

(best available control technology) will probably be required as part of the variance request. How will base flow of the creek be handled during the construction phase (bypass culvert)?

7. What are the design sizing considerations? Are the sizing calculations available or is the Division to assume that those submitted back in September 1981 are to apply?

8. What length of culvert extension is proposed?

Will the extended length have an adverse influence on the pipe's ability to handle the maximum design flows (i.e., potential slugging)?

9. Does the new location for the inlet structure have adequate channel head water depth to handle the design flow?

10. What are the stream channel gradients for the new culverted sections? Typical cross sections and longitudinal profiles should be provided for the new sections proposed.

11. If this modification is not included in the original MRP, then sufficient copies (six-DOG, seven-OSM) should be provided to update the plans on file with the regulatory agencies.

12. What are the final reclamation plans for the culverted sections?

Pursuant to UMC 761.11(a)(4)(ii) and 761.12(d), the Division must publish a notice in a local newspaper which provides the opportunity for a public hearing, if the proposed surface modification will be conducted within 100 feet of the outside right-of-way line of a public road accessing the minesite.

The road accessing Trail Canyon and the minesite has not been designated as a public or county road per se. It is the Division's legal opinion that a private road does not become public by virtue of use. Therefore, the Division does not propose to publish notice pursuant to UMC 761.11 and 761.12 for this modification.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

  
D. WAYNE HEDBERG  
RECLAMATION HYDROLOGIST

cc: Shirley Lindsay, OSM  
Joe Helfrich, I & E  
Sandy Pruitt, I & E  
Pam Grubaugh-Littig, DOGM

DWH/btb