

• 0030

Document Information Form

Mine Number: C/007/005

File Name: Incoming

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Date Sent: JULY 11, 1988

Explanation:

MINE SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION REPORT.

cc:

File in:
C/007/005, Incoming

- Refer to:
- Confidential
 - Shelf
 - Expandable

Date _____ For additional information

DOG M
ACT/007/00552C

RECEIVED
JUL 11 1988

United States Department of the Interior
Office of Surface Mining
Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING

For Office Use Only

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

2. Name of Permittee UTAH FUEL COMPANY		9. MSHA Number 42-01435-	10. Date of Inspection (Y Y M M D D) 880629
3. Street Address PO BOX 719		11. State Permit Number 007/005	
4. City HELPER	5. State UT	12. Name of Mine SKYLINER	
6. Zip Code 84527	7. Area Code 801	8. Telephone Number 637-7925	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. 0862	20. Type of Inspection (Code) C	21. Joint Inspection Yes No X	22. Inspector's ID No. 107
--------------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

23. Status		24. Type of Activity (check applicable boxes)	
A <input type="checkbox"/> 01 Type of Permit	B <input type="checkbox"/> A Mine Status (Code)	C <input type="checkbox"/> 20 Type of Facility (Code)	D <input type="checkbox"/> 04839.0 Number of Permitted Acres
E <input type="checkbox"/> 00075.7 Number of Disturbed Acres		A <input type="checkbox"/> Steep Slope	E <input type="checkbox"/> Anthracite
		B <input type="checkbox"/> Mountain Top Removal	F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Lands
		C <input type="checkbox"/> Prime Farmlands	G <input type="checkbox"/> Indian Lands
		D <input type="checkbox"/> Alluvial Valley Floors	H <input type="checkbox"/> 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	Standards That Assure Reclamation Quality and Timeliness
A <input type="checkbox"/> Distance Prohibitions	M <input type="checkbox"/> Topsoil Handling
B <input type="checkbox"/> Mining Within Permit Boundaries	N <input type="checkbox"/> Backfilling and Grading
C <input type="checkbox"/> Signs and Markers	O <input type="checkbox"/> Following Reclamation Schedule
D <input type="checkbox"/> Sediment Control Measures	P <input type="checkbox"/> Revegetation Requirements
E <input type="checkbox"/> Design and Certification Requirements—Sediment Control	Q <input type="checkbox"/> Disposal of Excess Spoil
F <input type="checkbox"/> Effluent Limits	R <input type="checkbox"/> Handling of Acid or Toxic Materials
G <input type="checkbox"/>	S <input type="checkbox"/> Highwall Elimination
H <input type="checkbox"/>	T <input type="checkbox"/> Downslope Spoil Disposal
I <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/> Post Mining Land Use
J <input type="checkbox"/>	V <input type="checkbox"/> Cessation of Operations: Temporary
K <input type="checkbox"/>	W <input type="checkbox"/> Other
L <input type="checkbox"/>	

File in:
 Confidential
 Shelf
 Expandable

Refer to Record No 0030 Date _____
 In CI 007, 005, Incoming
 For additional information

DOG M
ACT/007/0052C

RECEIVED
JUL 11 1988

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

DIVISION OF
OIL, GAS & MINING

For Office Use Only

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

2. Name of Permittee
W T A N F U E L C O M P A N Y

9. MSHA Number
42-01435-

10. Date of Inspection (Y Y M M D D)
8 8 0 6 2 9

3. Street Address
P O B O X 7 1 9

11. State Permit Number
0 0 7 / 0 0 5

4. City
H e l p e r

5. State
W T

12. Name of Mine
S K Y L I N E

6. Zip Code
8 4 5 2 7

7. Area Code
8 0 1

8. Telephone Number
6 3 7 - 7 9 2 5

13. County Code
0 0 7

14. State Code
W T

15. Strata

16. State Area Office
0 1

17. OSM Field Office No.
0 2

18. OSM Area Office No.

19. OSM Sample No.
0 8 6 2

20. Type of Inspection (Code)
C

21. Joint Inspection
Yes No
X

22. Inspector's ID No.
1 0 9

23. Status

A 0 1 Type of Permit

B A Mine Status (Code)

C 2 0 Type of Facility (Code)

D 0 4 8 3 9 . 0 Number of Permitted Acres

E 0 0 0 7 5 . 7 Number of Disturbed Acres

24. Type of Activity (check applicable boxes).

A <input type="checkbox"/> Steep Slope	E <input type="checkbox"/> Anthracite
B <input type="checkbox"/> Mountain Top Removal	F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Lands
C <input type="checkbox"/> Prime Farmlands	G <input type="checkbox"/> Indian Lands
D <input type="checkbox"/> Alluvial Valley Floors	H <input type="checkbox"/> 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 3 Refuse Impoundments
 - L Other: Specify _____

- Standards That Assure Reclamation Quality and Timeliness
- M 1 Topsoil Handling
 - N 1 Backfilling and Grading
 - O 1 Following Reclamation Schedule
 - P 1 Revegetation Requirements
 - Q 1 Disposal of Excess Spoil
 - R 1 Handling of Acid or Toxic Materials
 - S 1 Highwall Elimination
 - T 1 Downslope Spoil Disposal
 - U 1 Post Mining Land Use
 - V 1 Cessation of Operations: Temporary
 - W Other _____

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

DOGS M
10/10/05
JLC

26. State Permit Number

0071005

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

88 06 29

28. Yes No Do mining and reclamation activities on the site comply with the plans in the permit?
 If no, provide narrative to support this determination.

29. Indicate number of complete and partial inspections conducted by the State to date for this annual review period:

29a. 5 Number of Completes

29b. 8 Number of Partials

30. Indicate number of complete and partial inspections required by the State during this annual review period:

30a. 4 Number of Completes

30b. 8 Number of Partials

31. Has inspection frequency been met?

31a. Yes No Completes

31b. Yes No Partials

32. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION. [Enter violation number. Check appropriate box(es)]

Ten-Day Notice No.	Notice of Violation No.	Cessation Order No.	Violation Codes
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A <input type="checkbox"/> Authorizations to Operate
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	B <input type="checkbox"/> Signs and Markers
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	C <input type="checkbox"/> Backfilling and Grading
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	D <input type="checkbox"/> Highwall Elimination
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	E <input type="checkbox"/> Rills and Gullies
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> Improper Fills
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	G <input type="checkbox"/> Topsoil Handling
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	H <input type="checkbox"/> Sediment Ponds
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I <input type="checkbox"/> Effluent Limits
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	J <input type="checkbox"/> Water Monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	K <input type="checkbox"/> Buffer Zones
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	L <input type="checkbox"/> Roads
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	M <input type="checkbox"/> Dams
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/> Blasting
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	O <input type="checkbox"/> Revegetation
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	P <input type="checkbox"/> Spoil on the Downslope
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Q <input type="checkbox"/> Mining Without Permit
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	R <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeding Permit Limits
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	S <input type="checkbox"/> Distance Prohibitions
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	T <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Materials
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/> Other Violations

33. Name of Authorized Representative (print or type)

Rade H. Orell
Signature of Authorized Representative

Date
7-6-88

Signature of Reviewing Official

Date
7-8-88

04 0
06 0
15 0
04 0

Utah Fuel Company
P.O. Box 719
Helper, Utah 84527

Skyline Mine
Utah Permit #007/005

Oversight Inspection
June 28-29, 1988

Participants:

Rade H. Orell, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Albuquerque Field Office (AFO), Harold Sandbeck, Bill Warmack, Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining (DOGM), Keith Zobell, Bill Shriver, Utah Fuel Company (UFC).

Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report:

This was an oversight inspection therefore the Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report form has been completed accordingly. The inspection did not result in the issuance of any Ten-Day Notices to the State of Utah.

Introduction:

The inspection commenced the morning of June 28 and terminated in the late afternoon of June 29. We commenced with the records review followed by the field part of the inspection. The weather was clear to cloudy and rainy. Ground conditions were wet. A Pentax IQ Zoom was used to photograph areas of interest. The DOG M representative indicated his intention to conduct a partial inspection and that any activity beyond that would be my responsibility.

Records Review:

The records review included observations and discussions of the NPDES Permit, NPDES Monitoring Reports for the period July 1, 1987 to date, Self Inspection of Ponds, Water Monitoring Records, Sediment Pond Certifications, Underground Development Waste Quarterly Inspections, the Permit with Stipulations, Certificate of Liability (expires December 31, 1988) and Small Area Exemptions.

In the case of the permit we observed that the document is dated and was officially issued June 24, 1980 by the Office of Surface Mining/signed by the Secretary of the Interior. DOGM files in the Salt Lake City office indicate the permit expiration date is April

30, 1987. The indication is in the form of a letter from OSM to DOGM. DOGM subsequently relayed this information to UFC on 7/12/85. DOGM also advised the operator that the date for submittal of the renewal application was 12/31/86. UFC timely submitted the application, DOGM is still in the review process. The question is if the permit was issued in June 1980 the expiration should have been in June 1985 as opposed to April 1987. The question has not been resolved at this writing. The information will be provided to the program specialist toward some resolution.

*OK, we have
letter on file*

Field Inspection:

The field inspection included observations of the Mine Surface Facilities, Underground Development Waste Disposal Area and associated road, Train Loadout, and Small Area Exemptions.

Mine Surface Facilities - The inspection of the facilities commenced at the West Fork Inlet (West Fork Middle Creek). We confirmed that the culvert inlet at this location was in good repair at the time of the inspection.

We also observed the coal stockpile in this area. The stockpile is located in a small valley immediately below a diversion ditch. There is a basically undisturbed slope adjacent to and above the stockpile. The operator was advised to ensure that coal is not allowed to be stockpiled such that the adjacent vegetated slope is covered.

We walked the undisturbed diversion ditch from the West Fork Inlet to the North Fork Inlet (Eccles Creek). We found that the ditch was in good repair. We observed two small areas on the slope below the ditch where vegetation was dead for no apparent reason. While the shrubs on the slope appeared healthy the grasses were not doing well. The DOGM representative noted the situation and indicated additional research would be conducted by the Division.

We confirmed that the culverts located at the North Fork Inlet were intact and well maintained at the time of the inspection.

We also observed the markers used to delineate the disturbed area and the topsoil stockpile. The topsoil stockpile was generally in good repair at the time of the inspection. The Northeast side of the stockpile at the toe needs some minor erosion repair. Strawbales are used to control discharge in this area. We observed that the bales need to be maintained such that the erosion problems do not become violations of the performance standards.

We then traveled to the vicinity of the Crusher Building via the Mine Access Road. At the Crusher Building we observed the flow meter used to measure underground discharge to pond 001. At the time of the inspection the meter indicated a discharge of approximately 125 gallons per minute.

We inspected the coal stockpile and associated area located at the

South Fork of Middle Creek in the vicinity of the portals. Drainage control in this area is a question. We observed that runoff from the coal stockpile flows to a ditch located at the toe of the stockpile. From the stockpile it flows to a swale located East of the portals. We observed shotcrete and other debris blocking the flow of runoff. The DOGM representative indicated his intention to issue a Notice of Violation (NOV) for the problem. The operator caused the problem to be corrected before the end of the inspection thereby precluding the issuance of an NOV. The control of runoff from the disturbed area via ditches is an issue the operator is debating with DOGM as part of the renewal.

We continued the inspection with observations of sediment pond 001. This pond receives disturbed area runoff as well as mine water discharge. The principal and emergency spillways are combined in one outlet device. The spillway consists of a 48 inch diameter riser with a 12 inch diameter outlet welded to the riser at an elevation below the crest of the pipe. In accordance with procedures recently established by the AFO I advised the operator as well as the state representative that a TDN for the combined spillway would not be issued. I further indicated in accordance with the policy that the AFO considers combined spillways to be a program issue which will be dealt with on a case by case basis. Therefore, the situation at pond 001 will be reported to my supervisor accordingly. Pond 001 is an incised structure. The inslope banks were generally in need of minor maintenance. While the south bank of the pond needs some remedial work the integrity of the structure is afforded a measure of protection in that the bank is bounded by bedrock. There is an inflow at the Southwest end of the pond where some additional rip rap should be placed. Bedrock control of discharge is also evident at the Northwest inflow point.

Underground Development Waste:

The underground development waste disposal area is located near the town of Scofield. The waste material is being deposited in a strip pit from a previous surface mine. The site includes the pit, access road and diversion. The waste disposal site is identified by MSHA ID# 1211-UT-9-0038. The rate and volume at which material is deposited in the pit is quite low. For example, during 1987 590 cubic yards were placed in the pit. We observed that material recently placed in the pit is awaiting grading and compaction in two foot lifts. The material was too wet to work at the time of the inspection. Upstream runoff is being diverted via a diversion. The diversion was generally in good repair with a minor amount of maintenance needed on the upstream end. The operator was advised to maintain the structure such that compliance with the performance standards is maintained.

Loadout:

We walked the loadout in an easterly direction and confirmed that the site is generally in good repair. The outslopes of the loadout fill

are part of the small area exemptions described above. We confirmed that the drainage from the areas is being properly treated with alternate sediment control devices.

Sediment pond 002 is located at the loadout. The pond was found to be in good repair at the time of the inspection. We observed that the spillway design is the same as that described above for pond 001. The same situation with respect to combined spillways applies here as well. The situation will be handled in the same manner as that described for pond 001.

There is a seep at the downstream toe of the pond. The operator indicated that dye was placed on the inside of the pond but did not surface in the area of the seep. The operator further stated that the seep may be from the rock fill used to construct the loadout pad. The volume of flow from the seep while evident was not apparently affecting the integrity of the pond embankment at the time of the inspection.

Small Area Exemptions:

As indicated above the small area exemptions includes parts of the loadout, a water tank and associated area located southwest of the surface facilities area, and three wells/well houses located on Eccles Creek. In each case we confirmed that the sites were in good repair and that runoff was being treated with alternate methods of control at the time of the inspection.

Close-Out:

The close-out was a retiteration of the inspection. The DOGM representative reviewed the inspection results with the operator. I advised the operator's representatives about the combined spillway issue described above.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT
RANDOM SAMPLE INSEPCION (RSI) SUPPLEMENT

Permittee: Utah Fuel Company
 Permit No. 607/005
 Joint Inspection : y : Y/N Date 6 - 29 - 88

mg 12

Days since the Last State Complete Inspection (LSCI) 47
 Performance Standards in NON-COMPLIANCE this RSI 0
 Total Violations this RSI 0

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

<u>STATE ACTION</u>	<u>STATE'S REASON FOR NOT CITING VIOLATION (AFTER DISCUSSION WITH THE STATE)</u>	<u>CAUSES</u>	<u>IMPACT</u>
1) Existed on LSCI, cited	1) Not a violation	1) Permit Defect	0) Undeterminable
2) Existed on LSCI, not cited	2) Precluded by State Policy	2) Unusual Weather Conditions	<u>Damage Remains Within the Permit Area</u>
3) Cited Prior to LSCI, Abatement Pending	3) Not included under State Program	3) Unofficial Waiver	1) None or Minor
4) Occurred since LSCI	4) Warning given in lieu of a Citation	4) Operator Negligence	2) Moderate
	5) Violation not recognized (missed)		3) Considerable
	6) Practice allowed under approved Permit		<u>Damage Extends Beyond the Permit Area</u>
	7) Too minor to cite		4) None or Minor
	8) Working with Operator to Correct	<u>PROBABILITY OF EVENT OCCURENCE</u>	5) Moderate
	9) Other: _____	0) Undeterminable	6) Considerable
		1) None or Unlikely	<u>Obstruction to Enforcement</u>
		2) Likely	7) None or Minor
		3) Occurred	8) Moderate
			9) Considerable
		<u>OSMRE ACTION</u>	
		1) Deferred to State Action	
		2) TDN issued	
		3) IH-CO issued	
		4) Previously Cited, Abatement Pending	