

0014

Document Information Form

Mine Number: C 1007/004

File Name: Internal

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company N/A

Date Sent: N/A.

Explanation:

INSPECTOR'S STATEMENT

cc:

File in: C 1007 , 004 , Internal

Refer to:

- Confidential
- Shelf
- Expandable

Date _____ For additional information

File in:

- Confidential
 Shelf
 Expandable

Refer to Record No. 0014 Date _____In C/ 007, 004, Internal

For additional information _____

NOV 1982 # 82-4-12-2
VIOLATION # 2 of 2

INSPECTOR'S STATEMENT

(A) Event Violations (go to (B) if this is an obstruction to enforcement violation)

1. What harmful event was this regulation designed to prevent? (Insert the event listed on the Reference List and remember that the event is not the same as the violation.) *water pollution*

2. If the event has happened, describe it. If it has not happened, what would cause it to happen and how likely is that? (For example, if there is an area for which no sediment control is provided, has runoff from that area reached a stream? If it hasn't reached a stream, what would cause it to get there and how likely is that to happen?) *The event has occurred. Muck water from the #1 shaft excavation has entered the undisturbed main ephemeral stream channel. Underground development waste from the #1 shaft excavation was spilling over the berm into the undisturbed main stream channel.*

3. How much damage has already occurred as a result of the violation? Also, is the damage on the permit area or does it extend off the permit area? *Damage extends off the permit area. The extent of damage is mitigated considerably by the presence of straw bales in the undisturbed ephemeral channel. The extent of damage is minimal.*

4. How much damage might have occurred if the violation had not been discovered by an OSM inspector? Describe this potential damage. Would the damage extend off the permit area? *If not discovered muck water and underground development waste would have continued to leave the mine site and enter the undisturbed ephemeral channel. Damage does extend off the permit area but is mitigated by the straw bales in the undisturbed channel.*

(B) Obstruction to Enforcement Violations (answer for obstruction violations only, such as violations concerning recordkeeping, monitoring, plans, and certifications)

5. Describe how violation of this regulation actually obstructed enforcement by OSM and/or the public.

-II. Degree of Fault (only one question applies to each violation; first decide which question to answer).

6. If you think this violation was not the fault of the operator (perhaps due to vandalism or an act of God, for example), explain. Remember that the permittee is considered responsible for the actions of all persons working on the minesite.

7. If you think this violation was the result of not knowing about OSM regulations, indifference to OSM regulations, or the result of lack of reasonable care, explain.

8. If the actual or potential environmental harm or harm to the public should have been evident to a careful operator, describe the situation and what, if anything, the operator did to correct it prior to being cited.

9. Was the operator in violation of a specific permit condition? Did the operator receive prior warning of violation by the State or by OSM concerning this violation? If so, give the dates and the type of warning.

The operator has received prior warnings. See attached memo for inspection memo attached for May 20 inspection. Verbal warnings were given on inspections conducted March 10-12 and April 13, 1982.

III. Good Faith

10. ~~In order to receive good faith for compliance with an NOV or CO, an operator must have taken extraordinary measures to comply as rapidly as possible. The violation must have been abated before the time set for abatement. If you think this applies, describe how rapid the compliance was and what extraordinary measures the operator took.~~

10/25/82
Date

John G. Mitchell for Dave Lot
Authorized Representative

Sandy

July 8, 1982

Inspection Memo
to Coal File

RE: Price River Coal Company
Price River Coal Complex
ACT/007/004
Carbon County, Utah

A partial inspection was conducted at Price River Coal's Crandall Canyon development site on May 20, 1982 by Division Inspector David Lof. He was accompanied on the inspection by Rob Wiley of Price River Coal.

The sediment pond had been cleaned as requested during the April 13, 1982 partial inspection. The materials which had been removed from the sediment pond were placed just above the site proposed for sediment pond 013. This site is able to afford some runoff controls due to the pond having already been partially excavated. However, the operator was asked to better consolidate the materials and implement better runoff controls by May 24, 1982 in order to positively ensure adequate runoff control.

The disturbed area runoff diversion which carries muck water from the #1 shaft to the sediment pond was in need of maintenance. The operator was given until May 24, 1982 in order to have the diversion properly maintained.

The undisturbed runoff diversion ditch on the west side of the road to the substation, and the undisturbed runoff diversion channel above the #2 shaft needed to be better defined. The operator was given one month in order to accomplish this.

The topsoil stockpile near the junction of the mine access road by Highway 6 needed to be recontoured on the west side because it had been disturbed by construction activity on the new mine access road. The operator was given one month to have the recontouring completed.



DAVID LOF
RECLAMATION OFFICER

DL/tck

cc: Tom Ernett, OSM
Rob Wiley, Price River Coal Company
Inspection Staff

Statistics:

See Skyline Mine memo dated July 7, 1982