



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangertter

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

September 23, 1992

Mr. Edwin Settle, Supervisor EQC
Consolidation Coal Company
12755 Olive Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63141

Dear Mr. Settle:

Re: Refuse Area Diversion Ditch, Consolidation Coal Company, Emery Deep Mine,
ACT/015/015, Folder #3, Emery County, Utah

Recent inspections at the Emery Deep Mine have resulted in questions regarding the adequacy of the drainage plan for the refuse disposal area. Consol recently submitted information purporting that diversions around the refuse pile and coal stockpile are unnecessary. A review of that information by division technical staff indicates otherwise. Please review the enclosed technical memo which discusses areas that need attention. Consol should provide designs for ditches at the refuse pile as required under R645-301-746.330 and provide a map correctly presenting existing site configuration. Please provide this information by October 22, 1992.

If you have any questions, please call me or Sharon Falvey.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daron R. Haddock".

Daron R. Haddock
Permit Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: S. Falvey

S. Demczak, PFO

REFUDIVER.LET



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangertter
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

September 17, 1992

TO: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Sharon Falvey, Reclamation Specialist *SF*

RE: Refuse Diversion Ditch, Consolidation Coal Company,
Emery Deep Mine, ACT/015/015, Folder #2, Emery County,
Utah

Summary:

The purpose of this memo is to address the June 18, 1992 memo from Consolidation Coal Company regarding undisturbed drainage diversions around the temporary refuse pile and coal stockpile. The July 29, 1992 inspection report included an analysis of information regarding this issue. Following receipt of the inspection report, Dee Brey telephoned me questioning whether the memo would be addressed further; in a formal memo. This memo is the follow up formal memo I agreed to provide.

Analysis:

The June 18 memo, regarding undisturbed drainage runoff diversions around the temporary refuse pile and coal stockpile, were felt to be unnecessary according to the operator. The operator indicated the ditches would not provide a significant beneficial function. The operator indicates the flow from the 10 year-24 hour storm would be minimal. Although this may be true, the regulation requires the ditch to pass the 100 year-6 hour event. Additionally, there is some question about the accuracy of the existing maps. There is some question whether the operator has correctly identified the location of the refuse and coal stockpile, ponds, and secondary "jeep" road on the existing map as well as previously submitted maps. The map also appears to incorrectly show perimeter ditches extending beyond the point where they actually exist. From my observations during the July 29 th inspection I feel the ditches would provide beneficial functions.

The following drainage patterns resulted from a recent rainfall event occurring within a few days of the July 29, 1992 inspection.

1. The lower perimeter ditches No. 1 and No. 2 required maintenance at the north corners of the site. A good portion of the ditch was sediment laden reducing the ditch capacity. Additionally, water that had moved through the ditch

appeared to be very close to breaching the berm.

2. The rainfall event resulted in a drainage formation that abuts the refuse pile. This flow transferred some coal particles from the refuse pile and coal stockpile to the perimeter ditches 1 and 2.

3. The drainage is located closely to an undisturbed natural ditch. Drainage that abutted the refuse has the potential to breach into the natural drainage and completely miss treatment if its present course should deviate.

The required ditch has the potential to provide the operator with three major advantages.

1. The water would not abut the refuse pile, eliminating the potential for significant erosion of the waste material.

2. If the drainage diverted water to the pond north of the pile it would eliminate the potential for breaching the north corner of ditches 1 and 2.

3. Potential for completely missing the perimeter ditches and treatment of disturbed drainage would be minimized.

Recommendation

The memo suggesting that ditches for drainage above the refuse are not necessary is not accepted by the Division. The operator is requested to provide designs for ditches at the refuse pile as required under R645-301-746.330, and provide a map correctly presenting existing site configuration.