



0045

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

May 3, 1983

707 5484

REGISTERED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Ralph L. Jerman
Utah Power & Light Company
P. O. Box 899
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110

RE: Request for Additional
Information Concerning
Abatement Plans of NOV
83-4-1-1
Deer Creek Mine
ACT/015/018A
Folder Nos 3 and 7
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Jerman:

The plans submitted to the Division on April 12, 1983 do not adequately address all the hydrological calculations and concerns. The following information is requested by the Division to adequately address all our concerns. They are as follows:

C-1 and C-2 Conveyors

1. Regulation UMC 784.23(c) requires certification by a qualified professional engineer of Plate 1.
2. The statement on page 15, second paragraph, third and fourth sentences, cannot be quantified as the sole problem with the area. The problem is not solely with the undisturbed runoff but also runoff from the conveyor and road.
3. What design calculations were used to derive the 500 foot spacing of the water bars and what is the typical design of the water bar?

4. What will the applicant propose to do with topsoil removal, storage and protection where proposed diversion ditches are supposed to go?
5. Runoff from the conveyor and maintenance road should be passed through some sort of sediment control (i.e., silt fence, straw bales, sediment basins, check dams) prior to entering Deer Creek.
6. How is runoff from the powder magazine area going to be conveyed down to proposed culvert No. 1.
7. Diversion ditch No 3: (1) is there room for it between the conveyor and the slope?; (2) what is it going to do to the stability of the slope above?
8. What about revegetation of areas disturbed by installation of diversion ditches?
9. Plate I and Exhibit II conflict--look at Area II and IV on Exhibit II vs. areas associated with proposed culverts 1 and 2 on Plate 1.
10. A smaller scale map is needed which shows the maintenance road and mine access road (Plate 1).
11. In addition to this smaller scale map, cross-sections of the conveyor bench and illustration of the diversion ditch placement in relation to the conveyor should be shown.
12. In regards to the C-1 conveyor, it is felt that underpans are not adequate to do the job required. Culverts should be placed at these locations to eliminate future contributions of sediment to Deer Creek. The underpans only solve the problem area over the creek but do not eliminate any of the area associated with the conveyor.

Transfer Tower

1. Exhibit II does not provide the proper resolution. The scale is too large, it is difficult to read, and it is difficult to follow all the lines. Please redo at a smaller scale or provide a smaller scale of the immediate area, properly labeled.
2. It appears that Area II should be split because part of it flows south when it gets to the conveyor and part of it flows north.
3. Size of the contributing area used in Appendix IV is incorrect because you will also have contribution from part of Area II (see comment #2).

4. The applicant has also not provided adequate design drawings of the two inlets for the 36 inch culvert.
5. What are the sizing and riprapping calculations for the road side ditch to the drop inlet?
6. Why does the design storm precipitation vary from the Deer Creek Mine plan calculations (2.25 inches, 10-year, 24-hour storm) and also from the previous submittal (2.2 inches, 10-year, 24-hour storm)?
7. The area contributing to the drop inlet is disturbed and will have to be revegetated before discharge to the drop inlet will be allowed by the Division. This area is disturbed and should not be routed into the undisturbed drainage.
8. There are no design calculations in regards to the size of the pond and its approximate detention time.
9. What is the size of the ditch across the access to the transfer point?
10. Diversion ditch on the north side of C1 above the transfer pit:
 - A. Is there room for it?
 - B. Is it physically possible?
 - C. What will happen to the stability of the slope above?
 - D. How will it be maintained?
11. Is the inlet for the undisturbed area going to be located above cut for T.P. Pad, or at base of it on the T.P. Pad?
12. Drawings and maps need certification by a professional engineer.

The Division has asked a lot of questions because it is believed that Utah Power & Light Company (UP&L) has not adequately addressed a number of issues. The Division would like to see this matter taken care of as soon as possible, since the abatement time left on the violation is close to being terminated. Administrative delay will end upon receipt of this letter. Please govern yourselves accordingly. Questions regarding Notice of Violation (NOV) abatement deadlines should be referred to David Lof.

Mr. Ralph L. Jerman
ACT/015/018A
May 3, 1983
Page 4

UP&L should submit three more copies of this plan to the Division as soon as possible for distribution to OSM. Thank you for your time and effort in putting this together. Please keep us informed with regard to your plans in this matter and if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call myself, Mary Boucek or David Lof.

Sincerely,

Thomas Munson

THOMAS MUNSON
RECLAMATION HYDROLOGIST

TM/btb

cc: Chris Shingleton, UP&L
Shirley Lindsay, OSM
J. Smith, DOGM
D. Lof, DOGM
M. Boucek, DOGM
W. Hedberg, DOGM
J. Helfrich, DOGM