Document Information Form

Mine Number: C/015/019

File Name: Internal

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A.

Company N/A

Date Sent: N/A

Explanation:

HANDWRITTEN DOCUMENT

cc:

File in:
C/ 015, 019, Internal
Refer to:
- ☐ **Confidential**
- ☐ **Shelf**
- ☐ **Expandable**

Date _____ For additional information

TO: Mike T. Respond to Crane. My comments are: 8/17/78

1. Map not adequate to analyze drainage area, runoff, capacity, flow characteristics.
   Reply — We have used USGS maps to make these determinations. (1) Send Crane a copy.

2. Do not agree with this — Any vegetation which can be started on these cut and fill slopes will be an improvement on natural conditions. (2) However, set up a couple of monitoring points w/ UP&L to compare T.S.S. for two years between disturbed and undisturbed.
   May take more than 2 yrs for veg. to take.

3. (3) Lets require rip-rap at the pond discharge structure.
   note — This does not indicate that the over-portal ~~diversions~~ diversions are in non-compliance does it?
   WO

4. (4) Let UP&L to narrative monitoring plans
   fo ... and quality, sediment
   l ... ing plans, how sediment
   u ... where it ~~is~~ (sediment)
   u

File in:
- ☐ Confidential
- ☐ Shelf
- ☐ Expandable

Refer to Record No 0004 Date ____
In C/ 015, 019, Internal
For additional information

5. I don't know how to respond to this! (over)

TO: Mike T. Respond to Crane. My comments are:

8/17/78

1. Map not adequate to analyze drainage area, runoff capacity, flow characteristics.
   Reply — We have used USGS maps to make these determination. (1) Let Crane have a copy.

2. Do not agree with this — Any vegetation which can be started on these cut and fill slopes will be an improvement on natural conditions. (2) However, set up a couple of monitoring points w/ UP&L to compare T.S.S. for two years between disturbed and undisturbed.
   May take more than 2yrs for veg. to take.

3. (3) Lets require rip-rap at the pond discharge structure.
   note - This does not indicate that the over-portal ~~diversions~~ diversions are in non-compliance does it?
   NO

4. (4) Get UP&L to narrative monitoring plans for ~~quant~~ quantity and quality, sediment build-up measuring plans, how ~~sediment~~ will be removed, and where it ~~is~~ (sediment) will be placed.

5. I don't know how to respond to this! (one)

Since OSM has given us only tech. assistance, it appears that final decisions are with us. Once UP&L has given us the stuff listed in (1)-(4) we will give approval ~~based~~ contingent on Mike M's review of detailed engineering.

Lets bounce this off Jack.

A final item USFS- Bill Boley has asked whether we agree with UP&L's plans for the over-portal diversion. UP&L has applied for a permit to construct same from them. As I read OSM's opinion on the plans they have no objection to these do you agree?

Ka