

April 12, 1986

TO: Technical File

FROM: Rick P. Summers, Reclamation Hydrologist 

RE: Genwal Coal Company, Crandall Canyon Mine, Site Tour, May 2, 1986, ACT 032/015, Carbon County, Utah.

On May 2, 1986 Dave Cline and myself met with Andy King and Richard White representing Genwal Coal Co. at the Crandall Canyon Minesite. The purpose of this visit was to field verify the current proposal for revision of the surface facility layout at the site. Results of the tour indicated the following points:

1. The maps and plates submitted to date do not accurately reflect the conditions at the site. Particularly obvious were areas delineated as undisturbed which are in fact currently disturbed.
2. The feasibility of diverting undisturbed flow from the drainage above the portals is questionable due to the location of the portals and the mine fan (i.e. a culvert would be difficult to install through these features).
3. The proposed stilling basin location for the highwall drainage above the portals is not feasible due to its proximity to the mine fan and limited space available (appx. 15 x 25 ft. as opposed to the 22 x 55 ft. proposed).
4. The area proposed for the installation of a diversion for WS-1, WS-2 and WS-4 would require extensive disturbance for the correct installation of the diversion. It appeared as if the slope of the diversion would be considerably steeper than presented in the proposal (i.e. 6%).
5. The substation pad area is significantly larger than needed for the installation of the substation. In order for a small area exemption to be granted, a large proportion of this area must be reclaimed (backfilled and seeded). An area to the northwest of the pad was noted as being disturbed and not depicted on the map. The fill slope of the pad is steep and contains a large volume of rock material (especially at the toe). This makes the proposal to reclaim the area and

subsequently lower the curve number questionable. Additionally, a fill slope failure was noted near the eastern limits of the area.

6. The cut and fill area for the road leading to the portal pad was nearly vertical and contained a large amount of rock material. Again, the proposal to contemporaneously reclaim these areas is questionable.

7. Fill material from the construction of the substation pad and the road to the portal pad had filtered down through the areas considered to be undisturbed. The sediment pond should be designed to accomodate a predicted volume of sediment from these areas.

8. A undercut slope (appx 2-4 ft.) was noted near the toe of the sediment pond embankment in the natural slope (appx. 10 ft. from the toe of the pond).

9. An energy dissapator for the primary spillway in Crandall Creek has not been installed.

10. The manning's n value proposed by the applicant is incorrect in the vicinity of the pond embankment. Very little vegetation or channel obstructions exist in this area.

11. The outslope of the area where the current surface facilities are consists of large rock fragments. Considerable work will need to be done to reclaim this area as proposed in the latest submittal.

12. The locations for the proposed undisturbed diversions at the site are questionable as to their feasbibility.

Photographs (2 rolls of slides and 3 rolls of prints) were taken of the area for reference during our continuing review.

cc: S. Linner  
D. Cline  
D. Lof  
6000R-23-24