

### Document Information Form

Mine Number: C/007/004

File Name: Incoming

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING

Date Sent: N/A

Explanation:

MINE SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION REPORT

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

cc:

File in: C/007,004, Incoming

- Refer to:
- Confidential
  - Shelf
  - Expandable

Date \_\_\_\_\_ For additional information

United States Department of the Interior  
Office of Surface Mining  
Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report

For Office Use Only

1a Y Y M M	1b Batch	1c Report
---------------	-------------	--------------

2. Name of Permittee  
PRICE RIVER COAL CO

9. MSHA Number  
- - - - -

10. Date of Inspection (Y Y M M D D)  
8 4 0 4 1 6

3. Street Address  
PO Box 629

11. State Permit Number  
ACT-007-004

4. City  
HELPER

5. State  
UT

12. Name of Mine  
BRAZTAN COMPLEX

6. Zip Code  
84526

7. Area Code  
801

8. Telephone Number  
472-3411

13. County Code  
007

14. State Code  
UT

15. Strata

16. State Area Office  
01

17. OSM Field Office No.  
02

18. OSM Area Office No.

19. OSM Sample No.

20. Type of Inspection (Code)  
TDN

21. Joint Inspection  
Yes No  
X

22. Inspector's ID No.  
032

23. Status

- A  PE Type of Permit
- B  A Mine Status (Code)
- C  20 Type of Facility (Code)
- D  02720.0 Number of Permitted Acres
- E  00144.0 Number of Disturbed Acres

24. Type of Activity (check applicable boxes).

- A  Steep Slope
- B  Mountain Top Removal
- C  Prime Farmlands
- D  Alluvial Valley Floors
- E  Anthracite
- F  Federal Lands
- G  Indian Lands
- H  Other

25. Performance Standards (Codes)

Instructions: Indicate compliance code. For any standard marked 2 or 3 provide narrative to support this determination.

Standards That Limit the Effects to the Permit Area

- A  Distance Prohibitions
- B  Mining Within Permit Boundaries
- C  Signs and Markers
- D  2 Sediment Control Measures
- E  2 Design and Certification Requirements—Sediment Control
- F  Effluent Limits
- G  Surface Water M
- H  Ground Water M
- I  Blasting Procedu
- J  Haul/Access Roa
- K  Refuse Impoundi
- L  Other: Specify C

Standards That Assure Reclamation Quality and Timeliness

- M  Topsoil Handling
- N  Backfilling and Grading
- O  Following Reclamation Schedule
- P  Revegetation Requirements
- Q  Disposal of Excess Spoil
- R  Handling of Acid or Toxic Materials
- S  Highwall Elimination

File in:

- Confidential
- Shelf
- Expandable

Refer to Record No 0040 Date \_\_\_\_\_  
In C/ 007, 004, Incoming  
For additional information \_\_\_\_\_

lope Spoil Disposal  
ining Land Use  
ion of Operations: Temporary

United States Department of the Interior  
Office of Surface Mining  
Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report

For Office Use Only

1a  
Y Y M M

1b  
Batch

1c  
Report

2. Name of Permittee

PRICE RIVER Coal Co

3. Street Address

PO Box 629

4. City

Helper

5. State

UT

6. Zip Code

84526

7. Area Code

801

8. Telephone Number

472-3411

9. MSHA Number

- - - - -

10. Date of Inspection (Y Y M M D D)

840416

11. State Permit Number

ACT-007-004

12. Name of Mine

BRAZTAH Complex

13. County Code

007

14. State Code

4T

15. Strata

16. State Area Office

01

17. OSM Field Office No.

02

18. OSM Area Office No.

19. OSM Sample No.

20. Type of Inspection (Code)

TDN

21. Joint Inspection Yes No

X

22. Inspector's ID No.

032

23. Status

- A  Type of Permit
- B  Mine Status (Code)
- C  Type of Facility (Code)
- D  Number of Permitted Acres
- E  Number of Disturbed Acres

24. Type of Activity (check applicable boxes).

- A  Steep Slope
- B  Mountain Top Removal
- C  Prime Farmlands
- D  Alluvial Valley Floors
- E  Anthracite
- F  Federal Lands
- G  Indian Lands
- H  Other

25. Performance Standards (Codes)

Instructions: Indicate compliance code. For any standard marked 2 or 3 provide narrative to support this determination.

Standards That Limit the Effects to the Permit Area

- A  Distance Prohibitions
- B  Mining Within Permit Boundaries
- C  Signs and Markers
- D  Sediment Control Measures
- E  Design and Certification Requirements—Sediment Control
- F  Effluent Limits
- G  Surface Water Monitoring
- H  Ground Water Monitoring
- I  Blasting Procedures
- J  Haul/Access Road Design and Maintenance
- K  Refuse Impoundments
- L  Other: Specify overland flow diversion ditches

Standards That Assure Reclamation Quality and Timeliness

- M  Topsoil Handling
- N  Backfilling and Grading
- O  Following Reclamation Schedule
- P  Revegetation Requirements
- Q  Disposal of Excess Spoil
- R  Handling of Acid or Toxic Materials
- S  Highwall Elimination
- T  Downslope Spoil Disposal
- U  Post Mining Land Use
- V  Cessation of Operations: Temporary
- W  Other



Minesite Narrative  
Price River Coal Co  
ACT-007-004

Personnel: DOGM - Sandy Pruitt, Tom Portle, Sue Lanner, Tom Wright  
OSM - Donna Griffin, Frank Atencio, Albuquerque Field  
Office  
Walt Swain, Dave Maxwell, Don Mingus, Western  
Technical Center  
COMPANY - Rob Wiley, Ken Hutchison

This was a joint inspection by the above named personnel to accomplish 2 objectives. 1. The Western Tech Center (WTC) personnel needed resolution of problems concerning the pending permanent program permit before issuance and 2. the Albuquerque Field Office (ALFO) were inspecting 3 situations addressed in Ten-Day Notice #84-2-81-3. The latter is the sole subject of this report and thus are the only performance standards noted in Section 25 of the attached Minesite Evaluation Inspection Report and the only issues discussed in this narrative.

Section 25 (D) Sediment Control Measures. Drainage from the #3 portal, parking lot and portions of the road in Hardscrabble Canyon does not pass through a sediment pond, but rather a series of hay bales laid in the bar ditches paralleling the road running down the canyon. The surface area is approximately 5.7 acres, underground pumpage is also present at times when portal #3 is active. TDN #84-2-81-3 was written by Steve Martin for inadequate sediment control, failure to pass drainage to pond. At the time of his inspection the hay bales were buried in sediment and sediment laden water was passing over the top. DOGM personnel took a sample at that time midway through the series of bales which was analysed at 3,310 mg/l TSS. By the April 16, 1984 inspection, the ditches had been cleaned and new hay bales installed. These bales were not sunk below natural ground, or staked in. Bales were at angles so that gaps were often present at the bottom allowing free flow between the bales. Heavy sediment had already accumulated behind the hay bales at the top of the slope. Prior to this inspection, DOGM had been questioned concerning a small area exemption (SAE) that was thought to exist for this area. It was determined that an SAE did not exist, but had been requested by the company in the pending permit. (Pending for several years) Thus NOV #84-2-032-1 was written for failure to pass runoff from a disturbed area through a sediment pond. Because of the past history of sediment control violations at this mine I reviewed the enforcement history to check the previous effectiveness of sediment control measures. This is attached.

Section 25(E) Design Requirements. Violation #1 of TDN #84-2-81-3 was written subsequent to the March 1st inspection determining that 6 ponds did not have any spillway structures at all. Prior to the April 16th inspection it was determined that DOGM had granted a variance from this regulation on 3 of the 6 ponds. These were 003, 004, and 005, which are ponds in series. DOGM has since requested that a spillway be constructed on the lowest (last) pond 005 without issuing an NOV. DOGM did issue NOV #84-2-6-2 on April 5, 1984 requiring an appropriate combination of spillways on pond 007 and 008. The remaining pond, 006, was inspected during the April 16, 1984 inspection.

Pond 006 was dry at the time of inspection, as it often is, according to the state inspector. The watershed is 39 acres, including a refuse pile, but much of the water is intended to cross the haul road to the refuse pile at the same elevation as the downstream side of the pond. The inflow structure consisted of a 3" high berm and minute ditch crossing the road perpendicularly. Even as we inspected, the passage of pick-up trucks and blazers were obliterating the "conveyance structures." DOGM inspector Sandy Pruitt had issued an NOV to address this situation with a remedial action only to reconstruct the structure.

Pond 006 is a large pond with no spillways. It appears from all calculations to be oversized for the 25 year storm. Though Pond 006 does not have a written variance for spillways, it remains somewhat of a "special case", in that it has been historically enforced as if a variance were in place. The OSM Western Technical Center has determined that a spillway was not needed because the pond can totally contain the 25 year event.

Section 25(L) Overland flow Diversion Ditch (Ephemeral Stream Diversion) Violation #2 of TDN #84-2-81-3 was written for failure to construct and maintain permanent ephemeral stream diversion in order to have proper gradient. This addressed a situation at Price River where the company diverted runoff from one canyon which held their refuse fill into the natural channel in the adjacent canyon. The natural channel had suffered some disturbance prior to Price River's occupancy of the area which had resulted in fill being pushed into the drainage channel. This fill blocks the channel and forms a small pool upstream at the fill. DOGM has inspected the situation several times and sees no problem with it. This opinion was also expressed by the WTC on their visit April 16, 1984. We have requested that DOGM's hydrologist submit his calculations determining that the channel, bank and flood plain safely pass the 100 year, 24 hour precipitation event.