



United States Department of the Interior  
 OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING  
 RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT  
 219 CENTRAL AVENUE, NW  
 ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87102

Inspection Date: 10/14/82

INSPECTION REPORT DISTRIBUTION

TO:	<u>          X          </u>	OSM FILE
	<u>          X          </u>	STATE
	<u>                          </u>	COMPANY
	<u>          X          </u>	REGULATORY AND INSPECTION, WASHINGTON
	<u>          X          </u>	TECHNICAL CENTER
	<u>                          </u>	MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
	<u>                          </u>	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
	<u>                          </u>	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
	<u>                          </u>	U.S. FOREST SERVICE
	<u>                          </u>	INDIAN TRIBE

FROM: Jodie Merriman

Office of Surface Mining  
MINE SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION REPORT

INSPECTION NUMBER

INSPECTION DATE

I. MINE SITE

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Permittee <u>U.S. Steel</u>   | 8. Status (Check one)  |
| 2. Permittee Address<br><u>Post Office Box 807</u><br><u>East Carbon, Utah 84520</u> | a. <input type="checkbox"/> Active                               |
| 3. Location of Mine  | b. <input type="checkbox"/> In reclamation                       |
| a. County <u>Carbon</u>  | c. <input type="checkbox"/> Inactive                             |
| b. State <u>Utah</u>   | d. <input type="checkbox"/> Abandoned                            |
| 4. Name of Mine <u>Wellington Prep Plant</u>   | 9. Type of Facility  |
| 5. Telephone _____   | a. <input type="checkbox"/> Surface                              |
| 6. Date of Last State<br>Inspection <u>on file - 03/30/82</u>                        | b. <input type="checkbox"/> Underground                          |
| 7. Permit No. <u>ACT/007/012</u>   | c. <input type="checkbox"/> Other -<br>Specify <u>Prep Plant</u> |
| MSHA No. _____   | 10. Steep Slope  |
| OSM No. <u>same as above</u>   | Yes _____  |
|  | No <u>X</u>  |
|  | 11. Mountain Top Removal   |
|  | Yes _____  |
|  | No <u>X</u>  |
|  | 12. Prime Farm Land  |
|  | Yes _____  |
|  | No <u>X</u>  |

II. TYPE OF OSM INSPECTION

- A. Complete Inspection: Check appropriate box
- Statistical Sample Inspection
  - Others (citizen compliant inspections or second phase/assistance inspections - specify.)  
\_\_\_\_\_
- B. Other-Than-Complete-Inspection: Check appropriate box and reason for inspection.
- Statistical Sample Follow-up (date of Complete Inspection \_\_\_\_\_.)

- (a)  10-Day Notice follow-up (State failed to notify OSM or to take appropriate action).
- (b)  Federal NOV follow-up.
- (c)  Federal CO follow-up.
- (d)  Others - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

2.  Citizen Complaint Inspections

- (a)  Citizen's Complaint - imminent hazard or harm to public or to environment.
- (b)  Citizen's Complaint - 10-Day Notice follow-up (State failed to notify OSM or take appropriate action).
- (c)  Citizen's Complaint - 10-Day Notice follow-up (sample).
- (d)  Other - Specify \_\_\_\_\_

III. COMPLIANCE INFORMATION

Indicate the appropriate number for each performance standard (See instructions for clarification of the numbering system):

- 1. In compliance,
- 2. Not in compliance (State took action),
- 3. Not in compliance (State has not taken action),
- 4. Not in compliance (other),
- 5. Not applicable.

A. Performance standards that limit the effects of surface mining to the permit area:

<u>1</u>	1. Run-off control	<u>5</u>	6. Ground water monitoring
<u>1</u>	2. Surface water monitoring	<u>1</u>	7. Haul road maintenance
<u>5</u>	3. Mining within permit boundaries	<u>1</u>	8. Refuse impoundment
<u>5</u>	4. Blasting procedures	<u>1</u>	9. Signs and markers
<u>1</u>	5. Effluent limits		

B. Performance standards that assure reclamation quality and timeliness:

<u>2</u>	1. Topsoil handling	<u>5</u>	7. Timing of revegetation
<u>5</u>	2. Backfilling & grading	<u>5</u>	8. Highwall elimination
<u>5</u>	3. Timing of reclamation	<u>5</u>	9. Downslope spoil disposal
<u>5</u>	4. Success of revegetation	<u>5</u>	10. Post mining land use
<u>5</u>	5. Disposal of excess spoil		
<u>1</u>	6. Handling of acid or toxic materials		

C. For each standard marked (2), what action(s) has the State taken to cause the violation to be corrected?

See narrative report under topsoil.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

D. For each standard marked (3), indicate what action(s) the State should have taken.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

E. For each standard marked (4), explain why it is unknown whether or not the State has failed to take appropriate action.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



VI. ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

- 15 1. Hours travel to and from site
- 161 2. Acreage of disturbed area
- 6 hr. 3. Inspection time (on site)
- 3 hr. 4. Permit review time
- 4 hr. 5. Report-writing time

Jodie Merriman  
Signature

11-2-82  
Date

Jodie Merriman  
Print Name of Authorized Representative

Thomas E. Elvert  
Reviewed By

11-2-82  
Date

CARBON COAL COMPANY  
WELLINGTON PREP PLANT  
10/14/82

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

This inspection was conducted with Division Inspectors Bart Kale and Ken Wyatt and company representatives Glen Sides and Bill Kirkwood and Frank Atencio of OSM.

#### PERMITS

The following approvals are available for review:

1. MSHA approval for the lower refuse pile dated 07/20/76.
2. MSHA approval for the upper refuse pile dated 04/24/80.
3. MSHA approval for the clear water pond dated 09/11/78.
4. UDOGM approval for the lower refuse pile dated 07/20/76.
5. UDOGM final approval for the Reclamation Plan for the Sauerman Drag Scraper was given on 06/01/82.

There is no official letter of approval from UDOGM for the prep plant. This is because there was a question of UDOGM jurisdiction over prep plants in 1978-79. Although a decision was later reached that UDOGM did have jurisdiction, approval letters were not sent due to an oversight. The inspector for this mine, Bart Kale, is now working toward getting approval letters out for these prep plants.

#### BONDING

UDOGM does not hold a bond on the Wellington Prep Plant.

#### TOPSOIL

The majority of disturbance took place before 1977, therefore topsoil was not salvaged in these areas. Five topsoil stockpiles, generated from roadwork, are located on the north side of the Price River, east of the slurry ponds. The berm protecting these stockpiles could be redefined especially along the downhill sections. Mr. Kale issued NAOC 82-6-1-1 requiring the operator to correct the problem by November 7, 1982. The stockpiles were seeded last fall with crested wheat, tall grass and clover. Very little vegetation was evident during this inspection.

HYDROLOGIC BALANCE

There are no sediment ponds on site. Basically, the sediment control plan utilizes small depressions and low areas for ponding and evaporations. Although this is an unusual situation, inspectors have found no evidence of runoff leaving the permit area. The site is very flat with very little precipitation. I talked to Wayne Headburg, Division Hydrologist, and he indicated that the sediment control plan would be upgraded when the prep plant is reviewed for a permanent program permit. He also felt that it would be difficult to prove that sediment ponds are necessary at this time.

A ditch on the southwest side of the railroad carries undisturbed drainage from the southeast hilly area into the Price River. A monitoring point has been established where the ditch enters the river.

Two slurry ponds are located within the plant area on the south side of the river. These are used to catch the wash water when the plant shuts down. They are not designed to discharge. The majority of water used for washing is piped to the slurry ponds on the north side of the river via an overhead slurry line. This water is piped into the first slurry pond and is culverted through a dike into the second slurry pond and is finally discharged into the clear water pond. The cleaned water is then recycled back to the plant for washing. Make-up water is pumped in from the Price River.

SURFACE AND GROUND WATER MONITORING

Water monitoring data were available through August, 1982. There is no NPDES permit for the Wellington Prep Plant because none of the facilities are designed to discharge.

COAL PROCESSING WASTE

An approved refuse pile exists for the storage of coal processing waste. This refuse pile appears to be stable and no evidence of significant runoff problems was noted.

DISPOSAL OF NON-COAL WASTE

Non-coal waste is scattered throughout several storage areas. It appears that this material could be consolidated in a smaller area. This waste is periodically hauled to the Carbon County landfill.

CONTEMPORANEOUS RECLAMATION

No contemporaneous reclamation has taken place at the prep plant.

ROADS

No problems were noted on the access road.