



0019

STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

ACT/015/017
file File #2

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

355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

March 9, 1988

TO: John Whitehead, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Tom Munson, Reclamation Hydrologist *TM*

RE: Des-Bee-Dove Mid-Term Review, Utah Power and Light Company, Des-Bee-Dove Mine, ACT/015/017, Folder #2, Emery County, Utah

Focus Items

1. All permit conditions and stipulations from the Division and OSM permit have been addressed except for special condition Number 3. This condition requests that "The permittee shall either obtain written permission from the Forest Supervisor (Manti-LaSal National Forest) to relocate the access gate to the mine facilities from its current location to the proposed postmining location, or submit a commitment to leave the gate at its current location." To date, no information regarding the gate's relocation could be found in the files or the PAP.
2. The water monitoring plan is not current, clear, and concise. This is mainly due to the amount of additional information included in the PAP that really does not need to be included in the PAP. Conversations with Chuck Semborski of Utah Power and Light Company reassured me that he would be updating and improving the water monitoring plan section of the Des-Bee-Dove PAP. The Division should request that this is done as part of the mid-term review. All extraneous water monitoring information concerning other Utah Power and Light Company mines need not be included in the permit.

Page 2
Memo to J. Whitehead
ACT/015/017
March 9, 1988

3. The reclamation plan as it currently stands is in many senses an unrealistic plan from a hydrologic standpoint. They currently propose to drop the reclaimed drainage off the access road onto a rock fan with slopes in excess of 50 percent. I feel the operator should attempt to move the drainage over to the edge of the pad and the road so that they can feasibly engineer a channel. Not only will the maintenance of such a channel be reduced, but the slopes would be reduced to a more acceptable gradient to potentially place riprap on. With the incorporation of several drop structures, clay liners and energy dissipation basins, it may be possible to engineer a more stable channel. It is my opinion that the feasibility of engineering a channel as it is currently proposed, is not possible and would possibly end up in uncontrolled drainage flowing down the outslope of the pad. The permittee will have to request a designation of Des-Bee-Dove's final postmining diversion channel as an experimental practice, meeting the requirements of UMC 785.13 in order to make these changes.

djh
9486R/38