

0021



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

INSPECTION REPORT

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Ted Stewart
Executive Director
James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

Partial: Complete: X Exploration:

Insp Date & Time: 6/5-7/95 8:00am-2:00pm, 9:00am-12:30pm

Date of Last Inspection: 5/4/95

Mine Name: Hiawatha Mine County: Carbon Permit Number: ACT/007/011

Permittee and/or Operator's Name: Unites States Fuel Company

Business Address: P.O. Box 887

Type of Mining Activity: Underground XX Surface Prep. Plant Other

Company Official(s): Gary Gray/Rod Davis

State Officials(s): Peter Hess Federal Official(s):

Weather Conditions: Monday, Sunny-80's Wed., Cool-High 40's, Cloudy

Existing Acreage: Permitted- 12707 Disturbed- 290 Regraded- Seeded- Bonded- 290

Increased/Decreased: Permitted- Disturbed- Regraded- Seeded- Bonded-

Status: Exploration/ Active/ XXX Inactive/ Temporary Cessation/ Bond Forfeiture

Reclamation (Phase I/Phase II/Final Bond Release/ Liability Year)

REVIEW OF PERMIT, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS & PERMIT CONDITION REQUIREMENTS

Instructions

- 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 N/A.
b. For partial inspections check only the elements evaluated.
2. Document any noncompliance situation by referencing 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.

Table with 5 columns: Item, EVALUATED, N/A, COMMENTS, NOV/ENF. Rows include: 1. PERMITS, CHANGE, TRANSFER, RENEWAL, SALE; 2. SIGNS AND MARKERS; 3. TOPSOIL; 4. HYDROLOGIC BALANCE; 5. EXPLOSIVES; 6. DISPOSAL OF EXCESS SPOIL/FILLS/BENCHES; 7. COAL MINE WASTE/REFUSE PILES/IMPOUNDMENTS; 8. NONCOAL WASTE; 9. PROTECTION OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES; 10. SLIDES AND OTHER DAMAGE; 11. CONTEMPORANEOUS RECLAMATION; 12. BACKFILLING AND GRADING; 13. REVEGETATION; 14. SUBSIDENCE CONTROL; 15. CESSATION OF OPERATIONS; 16. ROADS; 17. OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES; 18. SUPPORT FACILITIES/UTILITY INSTALLATIONS; 19. AVS CHECK (4th Quarter-April, May, June) (date); 20. AIR QUALITY PERMIT; 21. BONDING & INSURANCE.

INSPECTION REPORT
(Continuation sheet)

Page 2 of 4

PERMIT NUMBER: ACT/007/011

DATE OF INSPECTION: 6/5-7/95

(Comments are Numbered to Correspond with Topics Listed Above)

4a. **HYDROLOGIC BALANCE: DIVERSIONS**

All diversions which were inspected were in good order and appeared to be functioning normally. It was apparent that the permittee has recently redefined many of the sites ditches. There was one 24" culvert located on the eastern side of the upper railroad yard, (the steel pipe routs drainage under the tracks) that was silted in approximately half full. Mr. Davis had this culvert cleaned during the inspection.

b. **SEDIMENT PONDS AND IMPOUNDMENTS**

During the field inspection of the site, it was noted that sediment pond #4 contained a large amount of sediment, particularly where ditch DD10 enters the pond. Sediment was 2.8 inches below the decant pipe. During the review of the "as built" for this pond (EXHIBIT VII-9) several items were noted which this inspector feels need to be rectified;

- 1) the maximum allowable sediment level elevation needs to be clearly defined.
- 2) the 60% sediment volume cleanout elevation needs to be clearly defined.
- 3) sediment level indicators should be installed in the pond(s) to help prevent maintenance problems.

The permittee should clean this pond when it dries out.

The first quarter impoundment inspections were conducted on March 10, 1995. No hazards were reported for any of the ponds. Catch basins 1-6 were also inspected, with no hazards being reported.

During the inspection, a bulldozer was seen operating on the eastern outslope of slurry pond 5. The cat was regrading the slope, filling in erosion gullies which had formed. One gully on the southern slope of this pond still needs to be addressed. Mr. Davis is aware of this.

d. **WATER MONITORING**

The February, March, and April 1995 discharge monitoring reports for discharge points 001A through 013A were reviewed. Only 001A had any flows; there was no access to 001A during February.

INSPECTION REPORT

(Continuation sheet)

Page 3 of 4

PERMIT NUMBER: ACT/007/011

DATE OF INSPECTION: 6/5-7/95

(Comments are Numbered to Correspond with Topics Listed Above)

e. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

001A continues to have exceedances with regard to total dissolved solids. According to the March, April and May '95 DMR's, the flow is discharging anywhere from 1150 to 1200 mg/l; the maximum allowable, according to the UPDES permit is 1000 mg/l. In a follow up conversation with Ms. Shelley Chamberlain of the Division of Water Quality, their enforcement response guidelines require either exceedances in four out of six months or exceedances of 1.4 times the permit limit for two out of six months for an enforcement action to be initiated. The fact that three months went by without sampling, (due to no access during the winter months) has apparently thrown a glitch into the EPA's computer red flag system. U.S. Fuels UPDES permit does allow for sampling to be conducted only when conditions permit access to the discharge locations. This inspector has emphasized this issue to DWQ. Water samples were taken on 6/21 for the Mohrland mine water discharge (001A) and the Cedar Creek drainage upstream from the Mohrland to compare the undisturbed TDS versus the mine water TDS. The samples were taken to CT & E in Huntington, Utah for analysis.

Based on the analysis of these samples which was received on 6/27, (TDS for the 001A discharge was 1,120 mg/l) notice of violation N95-46-2-1 was issued to U. S. Fuel Company.

8. NONCOAL WASTE

Noncoal waste was observed at the following locations during the field inspection;

- 1) barb wire and fence posts have been drug into the berm perimeter around the South fork topsoil storage pile.
- 2) the ditches on the SE approach road at the Middle fork loadout have old metal culverts, fiberglass ventilation tubing, etc. lying in them. These ditches also need to be redefined.
- 3) in the King 4/5 supply yard, oil contaminated soil was observed between the S & S battery scoop and a section of belt takeup. This was directly south of the old bath house. In this same area, a belt tailpiece has been placed in the pads center ditch. This ditch needs redefined.
- 4) scrap conveyor belting, brattice, sheet metal, etc. were observed in the North Fork timber storage yard. Mr. Davis has agreed to address these issues.

INSPECTION REPORT
(Continuation sheet)

Page 4 of 4

PERMIT NUMBER: ACT/007/011

DATE OF INSPECTION: 6/5-7/95

(Comments are Numbered to Correspond with Topics Listed Above)

9. PROTECTION OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL
VALUES

The southeast corner of the upper Middle Fork pad has a drainage problem. Water has breached the berm in two locations here (the berm is constructed of coal fines and nut coal), and is cutting erosion gullies in the bank. The depression that accumulates water here is small, but over time, the gullies have become significant. In discussing the problem with Mr. Gary Gray, it was suggested that the bank be pulled back to provide material to level off the area. A berm or V ditch could then be installed to route the drainage to the ditch on the southern perimeter. Mr. Gray agreed to address this problem.

The access road to sediment pond D003 is eroding. The slope here is steep; water bars might possibly be considered to correct the problem.

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

Copy of this Report:

Mailed to: Dean Davis (U.S. Fuel)

Donna Griffin (OSM)

Given to: Joe Helfrich (DOG M)

Filed to: Price Field Office

Date: June 29, 1995

Inspector's Signature: _____

Peter Hess
Peter Hess

#46