0032

File

STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

Norman H. Bangerter, Governor
Dee C. Hansen, Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

July 6, 1987

Mr. Andy King
Genwal Coal Company
P.O. Box 1201
Huntington, Utah 84528

Dear Mr. King:

Re: Response to Mid-Permit Term Stipulation Review, Crandall Canyon Mine, Tract I, Genwal Coal Company, ACT/015/032, Folder No. 2, Emery County, Utah

The Division has reviewed the response dated May 8, 1987 from Mr. Rich White, Earthfax, to the March 9, 1987 Stipulation Deficiency letter, and stipulations UMC 817.43-(1-2)-RPS/DC. The Division has not received any response to stipulation UMC 800-(1)-JRH. Stipulations UMC 817.43-(1-2)-RPS/DC and UMC 800-(1)-JRH have not been adequately addressed. Further requirements relative to stipulations UMC 817.43-(1-2)-RPS/DC are discussed in the attached technical memo. To adequately meet stipulation UMC 800-(1)-JRH the operator must submit a rider to the existing bond which must include a new Exhibit "A" or if the operator wishes to change the bond amount a replacement bond and a new Exhibit "A" must be provided. Review the March 9, 1987 Stipulation Deficiency letter, Randy Harden's Memo to File for further detail. The required information for both stipulations must be submitted by August 28, 1987.

Please contact me if you require clarification.

Sincerely,

Susan C. Linner

Susan C. Linner
Reclamation Biologist/
Permit Supervisor

JL/pb
Enclosure
cc: P. Rutledge
R. Harden
J. Leatherwood
T. Munson
1232R-8

RECEIVED
MAY 8 1987
DIV. OIL, GAS, MINING

May 8, 1987

EarthFax
EarthFax Engineering Inc.
Engineers/Scientists
7324 South 1300 East
Suite 100
Midvale, Utah 84047
Telephone 801-561-1555

Mr. James Leatherwood
Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

Subject: Genwal Coal Co. Diversion RD-4

Dear Mr. Leatherwood:

Genwal Coal Company has requested that I respond to the Division's concerns regarding apparent discrepancies in design conditions for a proposed diversion at the Crandall Canyon Mine labeled RD-4. This diversion is proposed for construction during reclamation of the mine and will extend from an undisturbed watershed north of the portal pad to an accompanying ditch located adjacent to the Forest Service road.

The apparent discrepancy in the design is between Plate 3-5 and Appendix 7-7 of the mining and reclamation plan. On Plate 3-5, a cross section (F-F') is shown east of RD-4 indicating that the highwall below the portal pad will be backfilled at F-F' during reclamation. The implication to the Division is that the highwall will also be backfilled at RD-4. However, Appendix 7-7 (pages 27o and 27s) indicate that RD-4 will be blasted into rock at the lower highwall.

While a portion of the highwall below the portal pad will be backfilled, this backfilling is not planned to extend as far west as RD-4. Rather, the backfilling will extend primarily east of F-F', ending west of cross section G-G'. Thus, although it could be implied from Plate 3-5 that a discrepancy exists between this plate and Appendix 7-7, this discrepancy does not exist and RD-4 will be constructed into rock as indicated in Appendix 7-7.

Please contact Andy King at Genwal or us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Richard B. White

Richard B. White, P.E.
Principal Hydrologist

Enclosure

cc: Andy King

June 17, 1987

TO: File

FROM: Tom Munson, Reclamation Hydrologist TM

RE: Tract 1 Mid-Permit Term Stipulation Response Review, Genwal Coal Company, Crandall Canyon Mine, ACT/015/032, Folder #2 and #3, Carbon County, Utah

Summary

On February 27, 1987, Dave Cline compiled a technical memo stating that the material received by the Division on July 11, 1986 from Genwal Coal Company had been reviewed and that diversion RD-4 had not been designed the same way in Appendix 7-7, pages 27o and 27s as shown on Plate 3-5. Based on the response received by the Division on May 8, 1987, addressing the concerns spelled out in Dave Cline's technical memo of February 7, 1987, the Division still needs the following information.

Body

After reviewing the calculations in Appendix 7-7 and looking at the cross-section of RD-4 found on page 27o, I feel that the following information is still lacking and needs to be addressed before final technical review:

At the point where Section 3 enters Section 4 of diversion RD-4, a 15-foot long section of riprapped channel with a d_{50} of 12 inches is recommended by the applicant. I would like to see calculations or documentation demonstrating the adequacy of this method of treatment as opposed to using an energy dissipating catch basin or similar structure at this point. The second place in the

proposed plan lacking information is the point at which Section 4 of RD-4 enters diversion RD-5. Since RD-4 enters diversion RD-5 at a right angle, the applicant must show how this will be accomplished without overtopping RD-5 during peak flows, and also what protection will be provided for erosion control as RD-4 enters RD-5 and is forced to make a right angle turn.

Recommendations

The operator should be notified that this information is still lacking, and the technical analysis of diversion RD-4 cannot proceed without this information.

djh
cc: S. Linner
J. Leatherwood
9486R/27