

0012

Document Information Form

Mine Number: C/007/006

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/007 006, Incoming

Refer to:

- Confidential
- Shelf
- Expandable

Date _____ For additional information

4TDOGIM

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 P L A T E A N M I N I N G C O		9. MSHA Number 4 2 - 0 0 1 7 0 -		10. Date of Inspection (Y Y M M D D) 8 8 0 9 2 7	
3. Street Address P O D R A W O F P M C		11. State Permit Number A E T 0 0 7 / 0 0 6			
4. City P R I C K		5. State W T		12. Name of Mine S T E R P O I N T	
6. Zip Code 3 5 0 1		7. Area Code 2 0 1	8. Telephone Number 6 3 7 - 2 8 7 5		13. County Code 0 0 7
				14. State Code 1 2	15. Strata
					16. State Area Office 0 1

17. OSM Field Office No. 0 2	18. OSM Area Office No. 	19. OSM Sample No. E 9 4	20. Type of Inspection (Code) C	21. Joint Inspection Yes No X		22. Inspector's ID No. 1 0 7
---------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------

23. Status		24. Type of Activity (check applicable boxes).			
A	0 1	Type of Permit	A	<input type="checkbox"/>	Steep Slope
B	A	Mine Status (Code)	E	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anthracite
C	2 0	Type of Facility (Code)	B	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mountain Top Removal
D	0 6 1 4 9 . 2	Number of Permitted Acres	F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Federal Lands
E	0 0 2 2 1 . 6	Number of Disturbed Acres	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"/> Full Reclamation on Schedule
D	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sediment Control Measures	P	<input type="checkbox"/> Spoil
E	<input type="checkbox"/> Design and Certification Required Sediment Control	Q	<input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Materials
F	<input type="checkbox"/> Effluent Limits	R	<input type="checkbox"/> Residual
G	<input type="checkbox"/> Surface Water Monitoring	S	<input type="checkbox"/> Reclamation
H	<input type="checkbox"/> Ground Water Monitoring	T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
I	<input type="checkbox"/> Blasting Procedures	V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cessation of Operations: Temporary
J	<input type="checkbox"/> Haul/Access Road Design and Maintenance	W	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
K	<input type="checkbox"/> Refuse Impoundments		
L	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Specify <u>State NIM 22-10-1002C</u> <u>WMC 77.19</u>		

File in:
 Confidential
 Shelf
 Expandable
Refer to Record No 0012 Date _____
In CI 007, 006, Incoming
For additional information _____

Other: TON 88-02-107-9
(Refer to Division)

UTDOGIM

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
 P I C K E R M I N I N G C O

9. MSHA Number
 4 2 - 0 0 1 7 0 -

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

3. Street Address
 P O D R A W O R P M C

11. State Permit Number
 A E T 0 0 7 / 0 0 6

4. City
 P I C K E

5. State
 W T

12. Name of Mine
 S T A R P O I N T

6. Zip Code
 3 0 5 0 1

7. Area Code
 9 0 1

8. Telephone Number
 0 3 7 - 3 8 7 5

13. County Code
 0 0 7

14. State Code
 4 2

15. Strata

16. State Area Office
 0 1

17. OSM Field Office No.
 0 2

18. OSM Area Office No.

19. OSM Sample No.
 3 9 4

20. Type of Inspection (Code)
 C

21. Joint Inspection
 Yes No
 X

22. Inspector's ID No.
 1 0 7

23. Status

A 0 1 Type of Permit

B A Mine Status (Code)

C 2 0 Type of Facility (Code)

D 0 6 1 4 9 . 0 2 Number of Permitted Acres

E 0 0 2 2 1 . 0 6 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 2 Sediment Control Measures
- E 1 Design and Certification Requirements--Sediment Control
- F 1 Effluent Limits
- G 1 Surface Water Monitoring
- H 1 Ground Water Monitoring
- I 1 Blasting Procedures
- J 1 Haul/Access Road Design and Maintenance
- K 1 Refuse Impoundments
- L 2 Other: Specify state NJNJ - 22 has - 11222
WMC 77.14

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 1 Other TN 88-02-107-9
(refuse divisions)

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

WAT LOG 611

26. State Permit Number

0	0	7	/	0	0	6													
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

8	8	0	9	2	9
---	---	---	---	---	---

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. 01 Number of Completes

29b. 02 Number of Partials

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

30a. 01 Number of Completes

30b. 02 Number of Partials

31. Has inspection frequency been met?

Yes No

31a. Completes

Yes No

31b. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 88-02-107-009	<input type="checkbox"/> - - - - -	<input type="checkbox"/> - - - - -	
A <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Authorizations to Operate
B <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Signs and Markers
C <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Backfilling and Grading
D <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Highwall Elimination
E <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rills and Gullies
F <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Improper Fills <i>(m. l. w. pink)</i>
G <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Topsoil Handling
H <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sediment Ponds <i>10-17</i>
I <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Effluent Limits
J <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Water Monitoring
K <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Buffer Zones
L <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Roads <i>road pat.</i>
M <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dams
N <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Blasting
O <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revegetation
P <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Spoil on the Downslope
Q <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mining Without Permit
R <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Exceeding Permit Limits
S <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Distance Prohibitions
T <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Toxic Materials
U <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 88-02-107-9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Violations

33. Name of Authorized Representative (print or type)

<i>Rade H. Orell</i>	Date	20 2
<i>Rade H. Orell</i>	10/02/88	03 0
<i>[Signature]</i>	Date	13 3
<i>[Signature]</i>	10-5-88	08 0

Cyprus-Plateau Mining Company
P.O. Drawer PMC
Price, Utah 84501

Star Point Mine
Utah Permit No. 007/006

Oversight Inspection
September 27-29, 1988

Participants:

Rade H. Orell, Office of Surface Mining, Albuquerque Field Office (AFO), Bill Malensik, Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining (DOG M), Ben Grimes, Steve Johnson, Cyprus-Plateau Mining Company.

Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report Form:

The Mine Site Evaluation Inspection Report form has been completed to reflect the oversight inspection. The number 2 is at Performance Standard Codes D, Sediment Control Measures, and L, Other, to indicate the DOGM issuance of a three part Notice of Violation 88-26-15-3(1-3) and W, Other, to indicate the issuance of Ten-Day Notice (TDN) 88-02-107-9. The state Notice of Violation (NOV) and the TDN are explained in greater detail later in this report.

Introduction:

The inspection included a records review and field observations of the mining operation. While we observed and discussed more than is described in this report this narrative is intended to identify the more important aspects of the inspection. The weather was clear and mild. Ground conditions were dry. A Pentax IQ Zoom camera was used to photograph areas of interest. I presented my credentials to the company representative.

Records Review:

The inspection commenced with the records review. The records we reviewed included documents related to the approval of construction of the various sediment ponds, quarterly pond inspections for ponds 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and Treatment Facility 1, quarterly refuse pile inspections, Annual Refuse Pile Certification, NPDES Permit, NPDES monitoring reports (1987 - 1988 to date), 1987 Subsidence Monitoring Report, certificate of liability (issued 7/01/88, expires 7/01/89), 1987 Annual Hydrology Report, and 1988 Water Monitoring

Data.

The review of the Annual Refuse Pile Certification indicated that piezometers have not been maintained in accordance with the approved plan. The report indicated that two wells were destroyed. The field inspection indicated that one well has been lost. The DOGM representative therefore issued NOV 88-26-15-3(2) for the operator's failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the approved permit.

The review of the hydrology information was difficult. For example, the operator's representative indicated that the requirements of the 1981 monitoring plan were revised in August 1987, October 1987, March 1987, February 1988 and September 1988 (not approved at the time of the inspection). Time did not permit confirmation of compliance with the requirements of the monitoring plan relevant to each revision. In addition, we discussed a review previously completed by DOGM, in relation to the 1987 Annual Hydrology Report, wherein the Division indicated the operator failed to comply with the requirements of the monitoring plan. The Division later met with the operator toward resolution of the matter of failed compliance. The state of DOGM's Water Monitoring Program will be reviewed during the 1989 Oversight Year. The situation described above will be relayed to the proper AFO individual for inclusion in the review.

Coal Loadout Silo:

The field inspection commenced with observations of the Coal Loadout Silo and associated area. The loadout was constructed in 1985 according to Table 67, Existing Structures. The inspection of the loadout indicated that the east outslope of the silo pad does not drain to a sediment pond. We observed a toe berm and strawbales apparently installed to provide a measure of sediment control. We were not able to confirm that the area has an approved Small Area Exemption. In any event, the alternate practices we observed at the time of the inspection were not effective in controlling runoff from the site. The structures were not functional as a result of upstream sediment accumulations. We observed that runoff, evidenced by small erosion channels, had by-passed the strawbales. Therefore, the DOGM representative issued NOV 88-26-15-3(1).

The inspection of the area also included observations of a number of culverts, a pad at a conveyor belt transfer, top soil stockpile and sediment pond 8. The culverts we observed were in good repair, the top soil stockpile was marked with a sign, toe berm in place and generally in good repair and we observed sediment removal from Pond 8. The removal of sediment from the pond required accessing the upstream end of the structure via the embankment. The haul route of sediment from the pond also traverses the embankment. As a result the open-channel emergency spillway was not open at the time of the inspection. The operator's representative indicated the structure would be repaired at the completion of sediment removal. The remaining sediment ponds and the treatment facility are discussed under one heading below.

Sediment Ponds:

In addition to the inspection of sediment pond 8 we observed Ponds 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 and Treatment Facility 1. We observed that Ponds 2, 3, 7, and 9 were in good repair at the time of the inspection. With the exception of Ponds 2 and 8 the sediment ponds and Treatment Facility 1 include a single spillway and a separate decant. The issue of single spillways is being addressed via a Utah regulation amendment. Therefore, the AFO previously agreed with DOGM not to issue Ten-Day Notices for such structures.

In the case of Ponds 4, 5, and 6 we observed erosion problems. At Pond 4 we observed 4 erosion channels on the south bank of the structure and an area of severe erosion at the upstream end of the structure. The erosion extends from the inflow to the pond at least 500 feet upstream and an estimated average of 2 to 3 feet deep. Map 43, Surface Water and Sedimentation Control indicates a disturbed area diversion ditch is located in the same location we observed the erosion. The operator's representative indicated the erosion was caused by a plugged culvert. We observed a 24 inch partially buried culvert that was apparently exposed as a result of the uncontrolled discharge.

At Pond 5 we observed a large erosion channel on the west bank, and an area approximately 36 feet wide on the south bank. The west bank erosion is not at a designated inflow point while the south bank erosion is immediately adjacent to the designated inflow. The south bank erosion was caused by the by-pass of a plugged culvert. The culvert was operational at the time of the inspection.

At pond 6 we observed erosion on the south end of the embankment. The gully is a result of direction of surface flows to the pond via a small berm. The gully is approximately 18 inches deep and 10-12 feet long. That part of the pond embankment is not a designated inflow.

The DOGM representative issued NOV 88-26-15-3 for failure on the part of the operator to minimize the erosion described above.

Refuse Pile:

The inspection of the refuse pile included observations of the disturbed and undisturbed area diversions, piezometers, sediment control, as well as the refuse material. We also reviewed Volume 3 of the mining and reclamation plan (MRP) and Map 43. Map 43 indicates ditches 16 on the north, 8 on the east and the slope toe ditch on the south and west convey disturbed area drainage from the refuse. The map also indicates ditch 6B conveys undisturbed area drainage on the south side of the refuse. The MRP indicates the slope toe ditch and ditch 8 have been designed to pass the 25 year 24 hour storm while ditches 6B and 16 have been designed to convey the 10 year 24 hour storm. The Utah regulations at UMC 817.83 and 817.72(d) require undisturbed and disturbed area diversions at refuse piles be designed to convey the 100 year 24 hour storm. The DOGM representative elected not to issue an NOV because the ditch design has been approved by the

Division. Therefore, I issued TDN 88-02-107-9 to the state of Utah for failure to divert disturbed and undisturbed surface runoff at the refuse in accordance with the above referenced regulations. The TDN was forwarded to the state via certified mail on September 30, 1988.

Close-Out:

The close-out meeting was basically a retiteration of the inspection. The DOGM representative advised the operator of the NOV and its three parts. Abatement dates were mutually agreed upon by the operator and the DOGM representative.

I advised the operator of the TDN. We briefly discussed the requirements of the regulations with respect to diversions at refuse piles. I provided the operator's representative with a photocopy of the TDN and described the TDN process.

We discussed the variance provided to the operator by DOGM and apparently OSMRE for certifications for Ponds 1, 3, and 5 (Pond 1 was redesignated as a Treatment Facility as a result of the variance). I indicated that the variance may not have been properly issued in that the regulations do not provide measures allowing such variances. I further stated that the issue would be discussed in greater detail upon my return to the AFO hopefully toward some resolution. The concern has not been resolved at this writing.

We also discussed the refuse pile in terms of construction requirements. Cyprus-Plateau purchased coal from an AML coal pile located on the Price River. The intent was to market the coal. The coal was hauled to the site by an independent contractor retained by DOGM and placed on the refuse pile; the pile being the only site available to stockpile the material. The coal is on top of refuse, it was end-dumped, not compacted and the slopes are at the angle of repose. Testing of the material after it was placed on the refuse indicated ash content as high as 30 percent. The high ash is making the coal difficult to market. At some point the operator will have to make a decision about dealing with the material as waste. The operator was reminded about the requirements of the refuse disposal plan, particularly compaction, slope angles and combustible materials. The material will have to be rehandled to a greater extent than pushing with a dozer in order to achieve design requirements.

I also expressed our concern over the state of the water monitoring plans in Utah. I indicated that the situation regarding the plan at the Star Point Mine will be relayed to the proper individuals at the AFO for inclusion in the review during the 1989 Oversight Year.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement
TEN-DAY NOTICE

Originating Office: Albuquerque Field Office
625 Silver SW
Albuquerque NM 87102
Telephone Number: 505-766-1486

Number: X-88-02-107-9 TV 1

Ten-Day Notice to the State of Utah, Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

You are notified that, as a result of a Federal oversight inspection (e.g. a federal inspection, citizen information, etc.) the Secretary has reason to believe that the person described below is in violation of the Act or a permit condition required by the Act. If the State Regulatory Authority fails within ten days after receipt of this notice to take appropriate action to cause the violation(s) described herein to be corrected, or to show cause for such failure and transmit notice of your action to the Secretary through the originating office designated above, then a Federal inspection of the surface coal mining operation at which the alleged violation(s) is occurring will be conducted and appropriate enforcement action as required by Section 521(a)(1) of the Act will be taken.

Permittee: <u>Cyrus-Platinum MININGS</u> <small>(Or Operator if No Permit)</small>	County: <u>Carbon</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Surface
Mailing Address: <u>P.O. Drawer PMC Price Utah 84501</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Underground
Permit Number: <u>Act 007/006</u>	Mine Name: <u>Star Point</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

NATURE OF VIOLATION AND LOCATION: Failure to divert all surface drainage from the area above the coal processing waste and from the crest and face of the waste in accordance

Section of State Law, Regulation or Permit Condition believed to have been violated:

NATURE OF VIOLATION AND LOCATION: with the requirements of the regulations; Failure to divert surface water from the area above the fill through diversion channels designed to pass

Section of State Law, Regulation or Permit Condition believed to have been violated: UMC 817.83 UMC 817.72C

NATURE OF VIOLATION AND LOCATION: safely the runoff from the 100yr 24 hr precipitation event.

Section of State Law, Regulation or Permit Condition believed to have been violated: UMC 817.83 UMC 817.72C

Remarks or Recommendations: Diversion ditch design for both undisturbed and disturbed area drainage should ~~be~~ address the 100yr 24hr criteria

Date of Notice: 9-29-88
Co # P 949 025 770
marked 9/30/88 from SLS

Signature of Authorized Rep.: Rade H Orell
Print Name and ID: Rade H Orell

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENVIRONMENT
RANDOM SAMPLE MEIR SUPPLEMENT

1. Permittee Plateman Mining Co. 5. Days since Last State Complete Inspection (LSCI) 100
 2. Permit Number Act 007/006 6. Block 25 Categories in NON-COMPLIANCE this RSI 2
 3. Joint Inspection 1 Y/N 4. Date 9 - 29 - 88 7. Total Violations this RSI 4

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 SPECIFIC STATE 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. <u>UMR 817.142 (4) (C)</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>		<u>1</u>		
Description: <u>Failure to pass - alternate practices employed - not functional</u>										
2. <u>UMC 111.119</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>		
Description: <u>Approved plan 2 Refuse pile requires 4 monitoring wells - 1 well covered</u>										
3. <u>UMC 817.145</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>		
Description: <u>General areas adjacent to 3 separate sed ponds eroded as a result of uncontrolled runoff.</u>										
4. <u>UMR 817.183</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>		
Description: <u>Refuse discussion designs approved by SOGM - Not in compliance w/ regs.</u>										
5. / / / / / / / / / / / /										
Description: / / / / / / / / / / / /										
6. / / / / / / / / / / / /										
Description: / / / / / / / / / / / /										
7. / / / / / / / / / / / /										
Description: / / / / / / / / / / / /										
8. / / / / / / / / / / / /										
Description: / / / / / / / / / / / /										
9. / / / / / / / / / / / /										
Description: / / / / / / / / / / / /										
10. / / / / / / / / / / / /										
Description: / / / / / / / / / / / /										

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