

Document Information Form

Mine Number: C/015/019

File Name: Internal

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company N/A

Date Sent: JUNE 2, 1981

Explanation:

INSPECTION MEMO TO COAL FILE.

cc:

File in: C/015, 019, Internal

- Refer to:
- Confidential
 - Shelf
 - Expandable

Date _____ For additional information

June 2, 1981

#17 + #19

Inspection Memo
to Coal File:

RE: Cottonwood Portal
Utah Power & Light Co.
ACT/015/027
Emery County, Utah

On May 8, 1981, Division Reclamation Officer Tom Portle visited Larry Guymon, project engineer, at his office at Emery Mining Company, Huntington, Utah. The purpose of the inspection was to conduct a partial on-site inspection of the Cottonwood Portal.

During the office portion of this inspection, there were some questions raised as to the NPDES permit. In an attempt to answer these questions, Mr. Guymon and Mr. Portle visited the Utah Power & Light field office located north of Huntington. There they contacted Ed Agoston. He was able to answer questions as to the discharge of the pond which had occurred and been sampled on November 10, 1980. It had not discharged, to their knowledge, this spring. The sampling method to determine a discharge basically is a "as needed" approach; immediately subsequent to precipitation event Mr. Agoston would drive up to the site to attempt to take a sample. Neither he nor Mr. Guymon were able to tell me whether a NPDES permit had been obtained for the site. Subsequent to the inspection, I contacted Mr. Shingleton of Utah Power & Light who informed me that permit U-0022896 covers three discharge points, one of which is in the outflow from the Cottonwood Portal facilities.

I was also informed by Mr. Agoston, at this time that he would soon be leaving this position. The most likely candidate to take his place is a gentlemen named Chuck Sembroski.

During the field tour, the diversions above the affected area were inspected. These diversions were in need of some work. They particularly needed to be graded and some rocks had obstructed the ditch due to winter conditions. These need to be cleared out. I could detect no obvious erosion from either the beginning or the end of the diversion structure. Mr. Guymon committed at

of the inspe
only sign of
portal devel
instability.
the inspecti

File in:

- Confidential
- Shelf
- Expandable

Refer to Record No. 0018 Date _____

In C/ 015, 019, Internal

For additional information

ersion completed within one week
e site seemed pretty good. The
be filled in as a result of
owed no obvious signs of
ned in the ponds at the time of
from the irrigation system.

June 2, 1981

Inspection Memo
to Coal File:

RE: Cottonwood Portal
Utah Power & Light Co.
ACT/O15/O27
Emery County, Utah

#17 + #9

On May 8, 1981, Division Reclamation Officer Tom Portle visited Larry Guymon, project engineer, at his office at Emery Mining Company, Huntington, Utah. The purpose of the inspection was to conduct a partial on-site inspection of the Cottonwood Portal.

During the office portion of this inspection, there were some questions raised as to the NPDES permit. In an attempt to answer these questions, Mr. Guymon and Mr. Portle visited the Utah Power & Light field office located north of Huntington. There they contacted Ed Agoston. He was able to answer questions as to the discharge of the pond which had occurred and been sampled on November 10, 1980. It had not discharged, to their knowledge, this spring. The sampling method to determine a discharge basically is a "as needed" approach; immediately subsequent to precipitation event Mr. Agoston would drive up to the site to attempt to take a sample. Neither he nor Mr. Guymon were able to tell me whether a NPDES permit had been obtained for the site. Subsequent to the inspection, I contacted Mr. Shingleton of Utah Power & Light who informed me that permit U-0022896 covers three discharge points, one of which is in the outflow from the Cottonwood Portal facilities.

I was also informed by Mr. Agoston, at this time that he would soon be leaving this position. The most likely candidate to take his place is a gentlemen named Chuck Sembroski.

During the field tour, the diversions above the affected area were inspected. These diversions were in need of some work. They particularly needed to be graded and some rocks had obstructed the ditch due to winter conditions. These need to be cleared out. I could detect no obvious erosion from either the beginning or the end of the diversion structure. Mr. Guymon committed at this time to have work on the diversion completed within one week of the inspection. The overall stability of the site seemed pretty good. The only sign of erosion was in the area which will be filled in as a result of portal development upon approval. The ponds showed no obvious signs of instability. Very little water was being retained in the ponds at the time of the inspection. Most of this water was runoff from the irrigation system.

Inspection Memo to Coal File

ACT/015/027

June 2, 1981

Page Two

The irrigation system had retained its integrity through the winter and showed very little damage; except that occurring from rocks that might have hit the sprinklers during the course of the winter. There were no obvious signs of erosion from the runoff resulting from irrigating the area. Very little vegetation was apparent, although some seedlings were beginning to emerge at this time. The revegetation on the topsoil stockpile and subsoil were no better than the rest of the site. There was some question as to the stockpile locations since the slopes of the topsoil are very steep and thereby prone to erosion. Unfortunately there appears to be no better place to put the topsoil. I suggested, at this time, that when the middle pond is enlarged, the upper pond which is nearest to the topsoil stockpile could possibly be abandoned, after which the resulting level area might be used to retain some of the topsoil thereby decreasing the slope thus the possibility of erosion. Some erosion was detected. This was mainly due to the sprinkler system above the topsoil stockpile. Mr. Guymon committed to employing sediment straw bales for erosion control in this area. A little bit of work needs to be done in the drainage ditch. Some cleaning was required in this area, quite a bit had been done already this spring. Mr. Guymon committed to having all needed work done within a week. Gary Fritz in a previous memo from his December 8, 1980, inspection seemed inclined to think that the diversion ditch below these out slopes would not be adequate for a runoff event. I tend to agree with him, the ditch does seem undersized. However, because of the temporary nature of the ditch and the fact that little erosion would result if it were to overflow and go down the road its importance is questionable.

I detected no stability problems anywhere on the site and could see no affect where seeps near the coal seam of erosion or any other problem.

While speaking with Mr. Shingleton, I learned that UP&L does have container stock in storage stock purchased from Native Plants. They should be transplanted soon on-site since they are out of the greenhouse and need to be planted within two weeks. However, this process is being held up in the due to the current soft coal strike.

During the inspection, Mr. Guymon requested information regarding public hearing for OSM #009 which was held in Huntington on December 8, 1980. Mr. Guymon wanted to know what the results were. The copy of the Board order from this will be sent to him. He also requested a transcript from last Board meeting dealing with the proposed maintenance regulations. I have given him Tina Moore's number so that he might request from her an official copy of this transcript. I have also checked to see if Mr. Guymon may be put on the mailing for the proceedings and activities of the Board.

THOMAS L. PORTLE 
RECLAMATION OFFICER

TLP/btm

cc: Tom Ehmett, OSM

Larry Guymon, Emery Mining Co.

Statistics:

See Trail Mountain memo dated May 14, 1981.

Grant: A & E