

0007



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Ted Stewart
Executive Director
James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

November 2, 1993

Mr. Val Payne
Senior Environmental Engineer
PacifiCorp
P.O. Box 1005
Huntington, Utah 84528

Re: Sediment Containment Box, Resubmittal Review - Denied, PacifiCorp, Deer Creek Mine, ACT/015/018-93H, Folder #3, County, Utah

The Division received the resubmitted amendment, Sediment Containment Box, which has been assigned the permit change number ACT/015/018-93H. This application has been reviewed, been determined deficient and is therefore, denied. Enclosed please find two technical memos that outline the deficiencies.

Please resubmit the complete application.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Pamela Grubaugh-Littig'.
Pamela Grubaugh-Littig
Permit Supervisor

ALTR





State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Ted Stewart
Executive Director
James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

October 29, 1993

TO: Pamela Grubaugh-Littig, Permit Supervisor
FROM: Jess Kelley, Reclamation Engineer *JK*
RE: Amendment to Allow Construction of Concrete Sediment
Containment Box in Sediment Pond, PacifiCorp, Deer
Creek Mine, ACT/015/018-93H, Folder #2, Emery County,
Utah

SYNOPSIS

The Division received this amendment application on October 25, 1993.

By this amendment, the permittee proposes to build a concrete diversion dam in the sediment pond inlet channel, some distance above the pond, and a concrete sediment containment box in the sediment pond at its west bank. The diversion dam will give the permittee the choice of either sending runoff directly to the pond or else diverting it through a 12-inch line to the containment box. The containment box will have a number of baffles which will serve to increase the effective particle settling distance which the runoff must travel before mixing with the rest of the water in the pond. The containment box will catch a large part of the sediment which would otherwise settle out in the pond. The containment box will then be cleaned out when it fills to 80% of its capacity. This system will allow the permittee to perform the difficult task of cleaning the pond much less often than at present.

ANALYSIS

There are several deficiencies in the present amendment application. Those deficiencies are as follows.

1. Drawing 3 does not show the dimensions of the diversion dam.
2. Drawing 4 does not show the dimensions of the containment box. It also does not make clear whether or not the box has a floor--or even footings.



3. A reclamation cost estimate of \$9,781 is given for the containment box, but no detail is given as to how that estimate was calculated. And it is unclear whether or not that estimate includes the cost of reclaiming the diversion dam.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the amendment application be denied and that the permittee be required to correct the deficiencies listed above.



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Ted Stewart
Executive Director
James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

November 2, 1993

TO: Pamela Grubaugh-Littig, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Ken Wyatt, Reclamation Hydrologist *KW*

RE: Sediment Containment Box Amendment, PacifiCorp, Deer Creek Mine, ACT/015/018, Folder # 3, Emery County, Utah

SYNOPSIS

On September 27, 1993 the Division received an amendment from Pacificorp proposing construction of a sediment containment box adjacent to the Deer Creek Mine sediment pond. The initial amendment was denied on October 7, 1993. A second submittal was received on October 25, 1993 and will be reviewed herein.

ANALYSIS

The original submittal was denied because the maps and text were inadequate. This submittal has not attempted to correct these deficiencies. The same maps were supplied. Drawing 2 does include the baffles to be installed in the box. The cover letter associated this latest submittal states in the second paragraph: "After construction completion, the surface yard map (DS202E, Packet 3-9) and these drawings will be certified and submitted as a separate amendment." Isn't this submittal the amendment? The operator needs to submit the required information as an amendment prior to approval and not after approval. The permittee has failed to submit the maps as they would be incorporated into the Mining and Reclamation Plan (MRP).

The diversion dam is provided on drawing 3. A V-notch type weir is shown to handle excess water that cannot be diverted into the 12 inch pipe. No dimensions are shown for this weir. The operator will need to prove that this design will handle the flows associated with this drainage. What are the peak flows anticipated and what volumes will be accommodated by the 12 inch line before overflow.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that this submittal be denied until the permittee submits a complete amendment package ready for incorporation into the mine's MRP.

