0017

Document Information Form

Mine Number: C0070001

File Name: Outgoing

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company N/A

Date Sent: N/A

Explanation:

Inspection Report

cc:

File in:
C/ 007 , 001 , Outgoing
Refer to:
- ☐ **Confidential**
- ☐ **Shelf**
- ☐ **Expandable**

Date N/A For additional information

the petro-liquid but on the ground measures for spill prevention and containment between the tank and pond would be reviewed for potential violations should the event be observed. In addition, there is language in the EPA's regs (40 CFR Part 112.1 (d)(2)(i & ii)) that address tank capacities, 42,000 gallons or less and 1,320 gallons or less with a limit on the size of the container, which require the preparation and implementation of Spill Prevention and Control and Countermeasure Plans should a spill occur.

Mr. Tanner made note of the comment by the State enforcement team regarding the lack of the berm during the initial part of the inspection and took steps to remedy the problem before we left the site. An effort was made to return to the mine on the 30th to verify that it was being done. The berm was around three sides of the structure on that day with equipment in the area finishing the project.

A trash rack was requested by the DOGM,team for the upstream end of one of the haulroad culverts below the "bowl" because site conditions above the area were considered to be conducive to plugging with potential failure of the structure. An effort was made to review the mine plant to determine if a requirement was made but implementation may have been overlooked by the operator. No requirement was found but Mr. Tanner agreed that a rack would built and installed before the next inspection.

The third comment made by personnel during the inspection concerned the location of beltline rollers on a boneyard pad off of the No 2 mine yard. The rollers were set off for storage in the area but mine personnel had placed them in the disturbed area drainage bypass. Mr. Tanner said that they would be moved.

Another problem still under review is PCB identification and records therof on the mine. Questions were asked about levels and testing of transformers on line as well as those in temporary storage. One of the transformers, a Westinghouse oil filled 2,000 KVA unit ID# PXH78975, sitting on the loadout pad, off line has been on retrofitted and tested per mine personnel. No comment was made, however, regarding another unit stored on the same bench near the substation labeled as REUPTEGRAFF #56468 cooled with 80 gallons of oil. Several other on line transformers were noted that were not labeled for contaminant levels. Mr. Faust, an electrical engineer for the firm indicated that he is aware of the transformer status and has them on record but we did not see the data. I have taken steps to review the status of the transformers and laws regarding them with EPA officials. Comments regarding my findings will be posted as they become available.

OTHER INSPECTION COMMENTS

Snow conditions on the mine limited the inspection of the drainage control system to major components but in general the systems appeared to be working as designed.

Things could have been worse as far as limiting the accessibility and inspection of the area per Mr. Tanner, he said that normal snow pack this time of year runs in the four to five foot dept

File in:

Refer to Record No 0001 Date N/A
In C/ 007 , 001 , Outgoing
For additional information

the petro-liquid but on the ground measures for spill prevention and containment between the tank and pond would be reviewed for potential violations should the event be observed. In addition, there is language in the EPA's regs (40 CFR Part 112.1 (d)(2)(i & ii)) that address tank capacities, 42,000 gallons or less and 1,320 gallons or less with a limit on the size of the container, which require the preparation and implementation of Spill Prevention and Control and Countermeasure Plans should a spill occur.

Mr. Tanner made note of the comment by the State enforcement team regarding the lack of the berm during the initial part of the inspection and took steps to remedy the problem before we left the site. An effort was made to return to the mine on the 30th to verify that it was being done. The berm was around three sides of the structure on that day with equipment in the area finishing the project.

A trash rack was requested by the DOGM,team for the upstream end of one of the haulroad culverts below the "bowl" because site conditions above the area were considered to be conducive to plugging with potential failure of the structure. An effort was made to review the mine plant to determine if a requirement was made but implementation may have been overlooked by the operator. No requirement was found but Mr. Tanner agreed that a rack would built and installed before the next inspection.

The third comment made by personnel during the inspection concerned the location of beltline rollers on a boneyard pad off of the No 2 mine yard. The rollers were set off for storage in the area but mine personnel had placed them in the disturbed area drainage bypass. Mr. Tanner said that they would be moved.

Another problem still under review is PCB identification and records therof on the mine. Questions were asked about levels and testing of transformers on line as well as those in temporary storage. One of the transformers, a Westinghouse oil filled 2,000 KVA unit ID# PXH78975, sitting on the loadout pad, off line has been on retrofitted and tested per mine personnel. No comment was made, however, regarding another unit stored on the same bench near the substation labeled as REUPTEGRAFF #56468 cooled with 80 gallons of oil. Several other on line transformers were noted that were not labeled for contaminant levels. Mr. Faust, an electrical engineer for the firm indicated that he is aware of the transformer status and has them on record but we did not see the data. I have taken steps to review the status of the transformers and laws regarding them with EPA officials. Comments regarding my findings will be posted as they become available.

OTHER INSPECTION COMMENTS

Snow conditions on the mine limited the inspection of the drainage control system to major components but in general the systems appeared to be working as designed.

Things could have been worse as far as limiting the accessibility and inspection of the area per Mr. Tanner, he said that normal snow pack this time of year runs in the four to five foot depth range. With

this in mind several comments were made during the inspection of the records and mine facility about snow management on the mine. The operator normally loads snow off of the working surfaces and stores it in designated areas on the mine. They also treat road surfaces with a deicer and dessicant which results in TDS problems during spring runoff. That was verified in their NPDES reports for pond oo4A. Mr. Tanner said that they are limited to the materials available for the icing problems on the haulroad at this time but make efforts to use it sparingly to reduce the problem to a minimum. There was some discussion about redesignating storage areas to cut down on the initial loading of the drainage control system in the spring but no conclusions were reached. I would suggest that the problem be tracked for possible solutions to reduce the long term effects on downstream fisheries.

Mine No. 1 has been temporarily idled due to the prevailing market conditions but it is being ventilated and mine water is pumped on an as needed basis. Discharge from the mine was occurring during the inspection through their "Concrete Filter Pond", flows from their are measured and recorded off of a parshall flume set on the end of the structure. Mine water from old abandoned workings from the "east section" are also discharged through the end of the structure into the receiving stream, Whiskey Canyon an intermittent drainage. This flow is not recorded or monitored.

Work was underway on the No. 2 mine bench to tie in a high angle conveyor to their existing mine run conveyor so it can be outloaded through the stacker. The foundation was set, some of the steel was being put in on the bottom end and portions of the No. 1 mine run conveyor were being cut away for the connection purposes. Completion is scheduled for the early part of next year. Present mine run coal was being brought out and dozed across the storage area prior to loading in haul trucks that carry it to their mine loadout at the botom of the mountain.

Pond 004A, the major containment structure for the upper mine bench system had standing water but the pool level was well below the discharge system. The discharge systems appeared to be functional. One comment Inspection of downstream slopes on the pond were made for stability, no problems were noted. One of the mine water wells located near the embankment for the pond is down for maintenance, per Mr. Tanner.

Drainage systems for the haulroad were checked as they were encountered on the route down to the loadout. Mr. Tanner said that they were having no major problems with the system but did comment that the inside bar ditch was hard to maintain but it is now paved. All culverts and drop drain structures appeared to be intact and clear of debris. There also no crushed sections observed in the culverts checked.

The train laoadout which is located along Utah High 96, was part of an old underground mine complex which is no longer active. Mine entries have collapsed or are sealed. Railroad Right-of-way through the loadout is shared with an adjoining mine so the liability is

somewhat confusing but Valley Camp is committed on paper to maintenance and drainage control for the area. Of the three sediment ponds for the loadout, the northern one, 001A, has standing water but the level is below the discharge system. The comment was made by DOGM officials that the water in the pond may very well be alluvial in nature and some thought is being put into the potential for effects from mine related runoff.

A fifty gallon drum was noted on the inside rim of the northern most upstream clear water bypass going under the area. A small spill was noted but was of no consequence and the drum was moved to a containment area. A contractor trucking firm has a maintenance yard within the disturbed area at the loadout. No problems were noted in the truckers boneyard and turnaround area. No petro-related spills were noted in the shop area or around the fueling station.

Of the records reviewed no problems were noted. Mine plan files are well organized and easy to locate, efforts are on an ongoing basis to consolidate material and reduce the amount of overlap between record components. AS built certifications on the ponds were redone in September of 1990. A comment was made about the dating of copies on file, note was taken and efforts will be made to complete the information for future inspection. There was some question about the "concrete filter pond" and requirement for certifications for it, but the matter was taken care of during the inspection and copies were distributed to the appropriate agencies. Bath house water is controlled on site by collection and haulage to a permitted treatment station. NPDES records for UT-0022985 were current, no chronic problems noted other than the TDS spring related runoff mentioned earlier in the report. Their permit expires 7/31/92 for five discharge stations. Surety for reclamation purposes is issued through the Federal Insurance Co a branch of Home Indemity. Liability Insurance is through Home Indemity for policy GL 99 48 43 and notice of expiration is to be sent to the RA. Surface and ground water monitoring is done by a consultanting firm that has done it since the inception of the PL 95-87. Records weree noted for 8/14/90. Quaterly self inspections of the ponds on site were current with no problems recorded. One comment should be made regarding the pond, 004A. In the field, I noted lacked straw bales in the emergency spillway. The comment was made at the time that they were installed for a last line of defense for oil in discharges should they occur. I appreciate the effort but would caution that the placement of the bales at or near the spillway will affect the hydrology of that structure which in turn should be considered in the future if calculations are redone. If not they should be moved to allow the spillway to function as designed.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT
RANDOM SAMPLE MEIR SUPPLEMENT

10/30/90

1. Permittee Valley Camp of Utah Inc.

2. Permit Number ACT 007/001

3. Joint Inspection |X| Y/N 4. Date 11-30-90

5. Days since Last State Complete Inspection (LSCI) 30

6. Block 25 Categories in NON-COMPLIANCE this RSI 0

7. Total Violations this RSI 0

****

8. List (only once) all violations:
   1) where State enforcement was required and taken during the LSCI;
   2) recorded in the LSCI report but the State failed to take enforcement;
   3) observed during this RSI which clearly existed during the LSCI but the State failed to take enforcement; and;
   4) existing during this RSI which are not already listed under one of the categories above.

	A LAW / SPECIFIC STATE REGULATION VIOLATED	B BLOCK 25 CATEGORY	C ABATED (y/n)	D STATE ACTION	E REASON IF UNCITED	F CAUSE	G SERIOUSNESS PEO	H SERIOUSNESS IMPACT	I OSMRE ACTION	J OPTIONAL	K OPTIONAL
1.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
2.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
3.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
4.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
5.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
6.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
7.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
8.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
9.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										
10.	___ /___ /___ /___ /___										
	Description:										

STATE ACTION
1) Existed on LSCI, cited
2) Existed on LSCI, not cited
3) Cited Prior to LSCI, Abatement Pending
4) Occurred since LSCI

STATE'S REASON FOR NOT CITING VIOLATION (AFTER DISCUSSION WITH THE STATE)
1) Not a Violation
2) Precluded by State Policy
3) Not included under State Program
4) Warning given in lieu of a Citation
5) Violation not recognized (missed)
6) Practice allowed under approved Permit
7) Too minor to cite
8) Working with Operator to Correct
9) Other: :_____

CAUSES
1) Permit Defect
2) Unusual Weather Conditions
3) Unofficial Waiver
4) Operator Negligence
5) Other: :_____

PROBABILITY OF EVENT OCCURRENCE
1) None or Unlikely
2) Likely
3) Occurred

IMPACT
Damage Remains Within the Permit Area
1) None or Minor
2) Moderate
3) Considerable
Damage Extends Beyond the Permit Area
4) None or Minor
5) Moderate
6) Considerable
Obstruction to Enforcement
7) None or Minor
8) Moderate

OSMRE ACTION
1) Deferred to State Action
2) TDN issued
3) IN-CD issued
4) Previously Cited, Abatement Pending
5) Abated during or before OSMRE Inspection