



The State of Utah
 Department of
 Natural Resources
 Division of
 Oil, Gas & Mining

ROBERT L. MORGAN
Executive Director
 LOWELL P. BRAXTON
Division Director

OLENE S. WALKER
Governor
 GAYLE F. McKEACHNIE
Lieutenant Governor

Representatives Present During the Inspection:		
OGM	Priscilla Burton	Environmental Scientist III
OGM	Gregg Galecki	Environmental Scientist III
OGM	Steve Demczak	Environmental Scientist III
OGM	Jerriann Ernsten	Environmental Scientist II
Company	Dan Meadors	General Manager
Company	Chris D. Hansen	
Federal	Carter Reed	Forest Geologist

Inspection Report

Permit Number:	C0070005
Inspection Type:	TECHNICAL
Inspection Date:	Wednesday, August 11, 2004
Start Date/Time:	8/11/2004 9:30:00 AM
End Date/Time:	8/11/2004 12:30:00 PM
Last Inspection:	

Inspector: Jerriann Ernsten, Environmental Scientist II
 Weather: Sunny. Possibly 85 degrees F in the sun.
 InspectionID Report Number: 359

Accepted by: whedberg
 9/10/2004

Permittee: **CANYON FUEL COMPANY LLC**
 Operator: **CANYON FUEL COMPANY LLC**
 Site: **SKYLINE MINE**
 Address: **HC 35 BOX 380, HELPER UT 84526**
 County: **CARBON**
 Permit Type: **PERMANENT COAL PROGRAM**
 Permit Status: **ACTIVE**

Current Acreages

10,374.00	Total Permitted
79.12	Total Disturbed
	Phase I
	Phase II
	Phase III

Mineral Ownership

- Federal
- State
- County
- Fee
- Other

Types of Operations

- Underground
- Surface
- Loadout
- Processing
- Reprocessing

Report summary and status for pending enforcement actions, permit conditions, Divison Orders, and amendments:

This technical report was jointly written by DOGM staff. Representatives from DOGM, Canyon Fuel, U.S.F.S and the B.L.M. met to observe and evaluate the reclamation of the Mine #1 Breakout (South Fork of Eccles Creek). In addition to those persons listed below, the following representatives were also present: Mike Smith, Construction Engineer (retired and now consulting) with the U.S.F.S, and Angela Wadman, Geologist with the BLM. The reclamation was completed in October 2003. The vegetation on the reclaimed roads is in good condition. The vegetation of the portal area is in poor to fair condition, because species seeded are not present possibly due to grazing. The Division recommends another light seeding to offset the damage from the grazing. The Permittee will supplement with aspen seedlings in the area that shifted. The site may not suffer from invasion of nearby musk thistle because of the Permittee's diligent weed program. Reclamation was done according to plan except for the restoration of approximate original contour along the temporary topsoil storage road and ancillary access road.

Inspector's Signature

Jerriann Ernsten

Date

Thursday, August 12, 2004

Jerriann Ernsten, Environmental Scientist II

Inspector ID Number: 52

Note: This inspection report does not constitute an affidavit of compliance with the regulatory program of the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining.

Permit Number: C0070005
 Inspection Type: TECHNICAL
 Inspection Date: Wednesday, August 11, 2004

Inspection Continuation Sheet

REVIEW OF PERMIT, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS PERMIT CONDITION REQUIREMENTS

1. Substantiate the elements on this inspection by checking the appropriate performance standard.
 - a. For COMPLETE inspections provide narrative justification for any elements not fully inspected unless element is not appropriate to the site, in which case check Not Applicable.
 - b. For PARTIAL inspections check only the elements evaluated.
2. Document any noncompliance situation by reference the NOV issued at the appropriate performance standard listed below.
3. Reference any narratives written in conjunction with this inspection at the appropriate performance standard listed below.
4. Provide a brief status report for all pending enforcement actions, permit conditions, Division Orders, and amendments.

	Evaluated	Not Applicable	Comment	Enforcement
1. Permits, Change, Transfer, Renewal, Sale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Signs and Markers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Topsoil	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.a Hydrologic Balance: Diversions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b Hydrologic Balance: Sediment Ponds and Impoundments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.c Hydrologic Balance: Other Sediment Control Measures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.d Hydrologic Balance: Water Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.e Hydrologic Balance: Effluent Limitations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Explosives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Disposal of Excess Spoil, Fills, Benches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Coal Mine Waste, Refuse Piles, Impoundments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Noncoal Waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Protection of Fish, Wildlife and Related Environmental Issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Slides and Other Damage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Contemporaneous Reclamation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Backfilling And Grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Revegetation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Subsidence Control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Cessation of Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.a Roads: Construction, Maintenance, Surfacing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.b Roads: Drainage Controls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Other Transportation Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Support Facilities, Utility Installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. AVS Check	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Air Quality Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Bonding and Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Topsoil

Topsoil had been removed from the temporary topsoil storage road for use on the site. The temporary topsoil storage road was very nearly in the same configuration as previously, except that the cut slope was 5 - 7 ft high. The road was well gouged and vegetation was becoming established. The road was not reduced to a trail.

The topsoil storage area by the knob had been graded and gouged.

4.c Hydrologic Balance: Other Sediment Control Measures

For reclamation and sediment control of the road leading to both the South Portal area and the topsoil storage pile, the surface of the road was extremely roughened with random gouging with the bucket of a backhoe. The general footprint of the road remains with cutbanks and a general leveling or sloping back into the hillside. However, there were no areas observed above the road where water was apparently concentrating on the slope that would eventually report to the footprint of the road. Close observations of the reclaimed road indicated that any concentration of flow on the reclaimed road would be eliminated with the deep gouges. All areas of the reclaimed road were observed to drain naturally off the surface after entering two or three gouges - in the worst case. Based on the slope leading to the road, the lack of any concentration of water, the rapid establishment of vegetation on the gouged areas, and the rapid drainage off the footprint of the road, the Division hydrologist (Gregg Galecki) did not believe sediment control was going to be an issue in the future.

USFS personnel on site were very concerned about the remaining footprint of the road, and the areas where the reclaimed surface sloped back into the hillside. They felt due to the inward sloping of the footprint, the deep gouges will eventually fill in and create a deeply incised, eroding channel in the former road. The only recommendation they would apparently consider was to pull up material from downslope of the road, eliminate the footprint of the road, and backfill all areas where the road sloped into the hillside.

The USFS recommendation does a better job of returning the site to the Approximate Original Contour (AOC), and reduces the potential for possible concentration of flow and could be considered as using the Best Management Practices (BMP). However, the potential for erosion with the current reclamation is minimal in the Division's opinion.

7. Coal Mine Waste, Refuse Piles, Impoundments

Coal seams by the "knob" were covered. Waste buried against the portal highwall remained unexposed.

9. Protection of Fish, Wildlife and Related Environmental Issues

The Permittee had previously noticed and reported to the Division of Wildlife Resources an unauthorized trapping device placed on the Permittee's property. The trap was constructed in the stream bed and along the ancillary access road to the site. The trap had been removed before the technical visit.

10. Slides and Other Damage

An area approximately 70 ft wide by 70 ft long slumped since last year's reclamation of the South portal reclamation site. The shifted area is compacted and seems relatively stable walking across the site. Along the top of the slump is a slip plane approximately one to two feet deep. The shift did not reduce the integrity or size of the gouges or significantly impact the vegetation except near the slip area. The assembled group concluded that the slump was surface movement and did not extend into the fill. There were no cracks on the slope where water entry into the fill was possible. The base of the slump was well vegetated with vetch. Mr. Smith pointed out that surface movement was a regular occurrence of the landscape as evidenced by "pistol budding" of the Aspen tree trunks. Mr. Hansen indicated that the Permittee has plans to plant tree and/or shrub seedlings in groupings at the site, to help stabilize the slope. Mr. Carter suggested "whacking" down the aspen bordering the disturbed area to encourage rapid sprouting into the reclaimed site.

13. Revegetation

The areas evaluated include the road from the highway to the topsoil pile (used during project), road from the pile leading to and passing the south portals, and the south portal site. The road from the highway to the pile was ripped and seeded. The road leading to and passing the portals and the portal areas were gouged, amended with straw, and seeded. The seed mixes used were Table 4.7-4 (MRP) for the portal area and 4.7-5 for the roads. The cover on the roads may have been from 10 to 70% depending on location. Heaviest cover on the roads was in areas that received shade throughout much of the day or areas that were on the upslopes of gouges. The road from the highway had a fair proportion of forbs and grasses, while the road leading to and extending from the portals had mostly grasses. The cover on the portal area may have been as high as 20-30%, but species diversity was very low for most of the site. The Permittee reported that the cover and diversity was much higher prior to grazing by sheep passing through the area. The dominant species remaining may be a cereal grass most likely imported with the straw mulch. This grass is at least contributing to slope stabilization. Other plants observed at the portal site included grasses (grazed to tiller or deeper), legume (vetch that was not seeded), and possibly flax (also not seeded). There were large populations of musk thistle bordering the site as well as individuals along the roadsides. The Permittee is well aware of the weed problem and has a weed eradication program. The Permittee requested to plant seedlings of Quaking Aspen within the area that shifted, which the Division welcomed the idea. The Division also recommends another light seeding to offset the damage from the grazing.