

0021

Document Information Form

Mine Number: C/007/018

File Name: Incoming

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company United States Department of the Interior

Date Sent: N/A

Explanation:

Mine-Site Evaluation Inspection Report

cc:

File in: C/007, 018, Incoming

- Refer to:
- Confidential
 - Shelf
 - Expandable

Date _____ For additional information



007/018 #5
cc: Sharon

Devin - route to file see pg 4
Hogal

U. S. DEPT. OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Mine-Site Evaluation Inspection Report



1. Permittee/Person SOLDIER CREEK COAL CO.		9. Permit Number UT-007-018		10. Type a. Permit <input type="checkbox"/> b. RA <input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Address P.O. BOX 1		11. Inspection Date 09/16/93 <small>MM - DD - YY</small>		12. Inspection Type CC	
3. City PRICE		14. Permit Status A		13. Joint Inspection Y Y/N	
4. State UT		15. Site Status AP		16. Facility Type B	
5. Zip Code 84501		17. OSM Office # 020		18. RSI # 0061	
6. Phone Number 801-637-6360		20. M.S.H.A. ID # 42-00077		19. Land Code F	
7. Operator if Different than Permittee SOLDIER CREEK COAL		21. State Code 49		22. County Code 007	
8. Mine Name SOLDIER CANYON		23. AVS Permittee Entity ID Number 089070		23b. State Office	

24. Performance Standard Categories

Codes: 1=Compliance, 2=Noncompliance, 3=Not Planned, 4=Not Started, 5=Noncompliance Identified Elsewhere

A. Administrative 1. <u>1</u> Mining within Valid Permit 2. <u>1</u> Mining within Bonded Area 3. <u>2</u> Terms & Conditions of Permit 4. <u>1</u> Liability Insurance 5. <u>1</u> Ownership and Control 6. <u>1</u> Temporary Cessation	B. Hydrologic Balance 1. <u>1</u> Drainage Control 2. <u>1</u> Inspections & Certifications 3. <u>1</u> Siltation Structures 4. <u>1</u> Discharge Structures 5. <u>1</u> Diversions 6. <u>1</u> Effluent Limits 7. <u>1</u> Ground Water Monitoring 8. <u>1</u> Surface Water Monitoring 9. <u>1</u> Drainage -- Acid-Toxic Materials 10. <u>1</u> Impoundments 11. <u>1</u> Stream Buffer Zones	C. Topsoil & Subsoil 1. <u>1</u> Removal 2. <u>1</u> Substitute Materials 3. <u>1</u> Storage and Protection 4. <u>1</u> Redistribution	D. Backfilling & Grading 1. <u>1</u> Exposed Openings 2. <u>1</u> Contemporaneous Reclamation 3. <u>1</u> Approximate Original Contour 4. <u>1</u> Highwall Elimination 5. <u>1</u> Steep Slopes (includes downslope) 6. <u>1</u> Handling of Acid & Toxic Materials 7. <u>1</u> Stabilization (rills and gullies)	E. Excess Spoil Disposal 1. <u>1</u> Placement 2. <u>1</u> Drainage Control 3. <u>1</u> Surface Stabilization 4. <u>3</u> Inspections & Certifications	F. Coal Mine Waste (Refuse Piles/Impoundments) 1. <u>3</u> Drainage Control 2. <u>3</u> Surface Stabilization 3. <u>3</u> Placement 4. <u>3</u> Inspections and Certifications 5. <u>3</u> Impounding Structures	G. Use of Explosives 1. <u>3</u> Blaster Certification 2. <u>3</u> Distance Prohibitions 3. <u>3</u> Blast Survey/Schedule 4. <u>3</u> Warnings & Records 5. <u>3</u> Control of Adverse Effects	H. <u>1</u> Subsidence Control Plan I. Roads 1. <u>2</u> Road Construction 2. <u>2</u> Certification 3. <u>1</u> Drainage 4. <u>1</u> Surfacing and Maintenance 5. <u>1</u> Reclamation	J. Signs & Markers 1. <u>1</u> Signs 2. <u>1</u> Markers	K. <u>1</u> Distance Prohibitions L. Revegetation 1. <u>1</u> Vegetative Cover 2. <u>1</u> Timing	M. <u>1</u> Postmining Land Use N. Other 1) _____ 2) _____
--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	---	--	---

File in:
 Confidential
 Shelf
 Expandable
 Refer to Record No 0021 Date _____
 In C/ 007, 018, Incoming
 For additional information

25. Inspection Frequency a. Date of Last State Complete Inspection 09/16/93 Frequency for previous 4 Calendar Qtrs. b. Number of required complete inspections 4 Number of complete inspections conducted 4 c. Number of required partial inspections 8 Number of partial inspections conducted 8	26. Inspection Hours a. Permit Review 4.0 b. Inspection Time 18.0 c. Travel Time 6.5 d. Report Writing 6.0	27. Bond 490 0.0 0.0 c. Phase II released 0.0 d. Phase III released 0.0	b. Disturbed (Estimated) 0.0
--	---	--	-------------------------------------



007/018#5
cc: Sharon
Down - must file see pg 4
Angel

U. S. DEPT. OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Mine-Site Evaluation Inspection Report



1. Permittee/Person SOLDIER CREEK COAL CO.		9. Permit Number UT-007-018		10. Type a. Permit <input type="checkbox"/> b. RA <input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Address P.O. BOX 1		11. Inspection Date 09/16/93 <small>MM - DD - YY</small>		12. Inspection Type CC	
3. City PRICE		14. Permit Status A		13. Joint Inspection <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	
4. State UT		15. Site Status AP		16. Facility Type B	
5. Zip Code 84501		17. OSM Office # 020		18. RSI # 0061	
6. Phone Number 801-637-6360		20. M.S.H.A. ID # 42-00077		19. Land Code F	
7. Operator if Different than Permittee SOLDIER CREEK COAL		21. State Code 49		22. County Code 007	
8. Mine Name SOLDIER CANYON		23. AVS Permittee Entity ID Number 089070		23b. State Office <input type="text"/>	

24. Performance Standard Categories

Codes: 1=Compliance, 2=Noncompliance, 3=Not Planned, 4=Not Started, 5=Noncompliance Identified Elsewhere

A. Administrative

- 1 Mining within Valid Permit
- 1 Mining within Bonded Area
- 2 Terms & Conditions of Permit
- 1 Liability Insurance
- 1 Ownership and Control
- 1 Temporary Cessation

B. Hydrologic Balance

- 1 Drainage Control
- 1 Inspections & Certifications
- 1 Siltation Structures
- 1 Discharge Structures
- 1 Diversions
- 1 Effluent Limits
- 1 Ground Water Monitoring
- 1 Surface Water Monitoring
- 1 Drainage -- Acid-Toxic Materials
- 1 Impoundments
- 1 Stream Buffer Zones

C. Topsoil & Subsoil

- 1 Removal
- 1 Substitute Materials
- 1 Storage and Protection
- 1 Redistribution

D. Backfilling & Grading

- 1 Exposed Openings
- 1 Contemporaneous Reclamation
- 1 Approximate Original Contour
- 1 Highwall Elimination
- 1 Steep Slopes (includes downslope)
- 1 Handling of Acid & Toxic Materials
- 1 Stabilization (rills and gullies)

E. Excess Spoil Disposal

- 1 Placement
- 1 Drainage Control
- 1 Surface Stabilization
- 3 Inspections & Certifications

F. Coal Mine Waste

(Refuse Piles/Impoundments)

- 3 Drainage Control
- 3 Surface Stabilization
- 3 Placement
- 3 Inspections and Certifications
- 3 Impounding Structures

G. Use of Explosives

- 3 Blaster Certification
- 3 Distance Prohibitions
- 3 Blast Survey/Schedule
- 3 Warnings & Records
- 3 Control of Adverse Effects

H. 1 Subsidence Control Plan

I. Roads

- 2 Road Construction
- 2 Certification
- 1 Drainage
- 1 Surfacing and Maintenance
- 1 Reclamation

J. Signs & Markers

- 1 Signs
- 1 Markers

K. 1 Distance Prohibitions

L. Revegetation

- 1 Vegetative Cover
- 1 Timing

M. 1 Postmining Land Use

N. Other

- _____
- _____
- _____

25. Inspection Frequency

a. Date of Last State Complete Inspection **09/16/93**

Frequency for previous 4 Calendar Qtrs.

b. Number of required complete inspections **4** Number of complete inspections conducted **4**

c. Number of required partial inspections **8** Number of partial inspections conducted **8**

26. Inspection Hours

a. Permit Review **4.0**

b. Inspection Time **18.0**

c. Travel Time **6.5**

d. Report Writing **6.0**

27. Bonded Acres

a. Total bonded **4909.6**

b. Phase I released **0.0**

c. Phase II released **0.0**

d. Phase III released **0.0**

28. Acres

a. Permitted **6958.5**

b. Disturbed (Estimated) **0.0**

Page 1 of _____
Revised July 1, 1993

U. S. DEPT. OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Mine-Site Evaluation Inspection Report

Permit Number UT-007-018

Inspection Date 09/16/93

29. Identified Violation Data.

For inspection types C (Complete Random Sample) and SC or SP (Complete or Partial In-depth Review), list all violations present during the current Federal inspection and all violations, cited or uncited, identified in the last State complete inspection report. For any other inspection type, including Federal program inspections, list only violations observed during the current inspection or subject of current Federal follow-up actions.

B Per. Std. Category	C Abated (Y/N)	D State Action	E Reason if Uncited	F Cause	G Seriousness		H Impact	I OSM Action	J OSM Action Number	K Optional
					PEO	Impact				
A. Specific State Law/Regulations Violated: <u>645-301-742.423</u> Description: <u>DESIGNS FOR PRIMARY ROAD</u>										
1	II	N	2	4	1	8	1		V#	
A. Specific State Law/Regulations Violated: <u>645-301-512.250</u> Description: <u>AS BUILT CERTIFICATION FOR PRIMARY ROADS</u>										
2	I2	N	2	4	2	8	1		V#	
A. Specific State Law/Regulations Violated: <u>645-300-143</u> Description: <u>MINE PLAN DEFICIENCY</u>										
3	A3	N	2	4	2	8	1		V#	
A. Specific State Law/Regulations Violated: _____ Description: _____										
4									V#	
A. Specific State Law/Regulations Violated: _____ Description: _____										
5									V#	
A. Specific State Law/Regulations Violated: _____ Description: _____										
6									V#	
A. Specific State Law/Regulations Violated: _____ Description: _____										
7									V#	

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| D. State Action
1) Existed on LSCI, Cited
2) Existed on LSCI, Not Cited
3) Cited Prior to LSCI, Abatement Pending
4) Occurred Since LSCI
5) N/A Federal Program
6) N/A Permit Defect | E. State's Reason for not Citing Violation
1) Not a Violation
2) Precluded by State Policy
3) Not Included under State Program
4) Warning Given in Lieu of a Citation
5) Violation Not Recognized
6) Practice Allowed under Approved Permit
7) Too Minor to Cite
8) Working with Operator to Correct
9) Other _____ | F. Cause
1) Permit Defect
2) Unusual Weather Conditions
3) Unofficial Waiver
4) Operator Negligence
5) Other _____ | G. Probability of Event Occurrence
1) None or Unlikely
2) Likely
3) Occurred |
| H. Impact
Damage Remains Within the Permit Area
1) None or Minor
2) Moderate
3) Considerable
Damage Extends Beyond the Permit Area
4) None or Minor
5) Moderate
6) Considerable
Obstruction to Enforcement
7) None or Minor
8) Moderate
9) Considerable | | I. OSM Action This Inspection
1) Deferred to State Action
2) TDN Issued
3) NOV Issued
4) FTA-CO Issued
5) IH-CO Issued (Imminent Environmental Harm)
6) ID-CO Issued (Imminent Danger to Public)
7) Previously Cited by RA, Abatement Pending
8) Abated during or before OSM Inspection
9) Follow-up of Federal Action | |

30. Signature

Inspector's Signature

GARY FRITZ

Inspector's Printed Name

31. OSM Inspector ID#

Dated: 09/24/93 244

Reviewing Official:

Review Date: 9/24/93

Page 2 of

Revised July 1, 1993

September 15 & 16, 1993

Soldier Creek Coal Co
PO Box 1
Price, Utah

Soldier Creek mine

Personnel Present During the Inspection:

Tom Paluso Soldier Creek Coal
David Spillman Soldier Creek Coal
Sharon Falvey Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
Gary Fritz Office of Surface Mining/Albuquerque Field Office
#244

Weather and Ground Conditions During the Inspection:
Cloudy and warm with rain in the afternoon

The Division was notified about my schedule and was able to send someone to the mine for a joint inspection.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

There were no unabated State enforcement actions issued prior to this inspection that required compliance during this inspection.

A three part State violation was issued to the company during this inspection. Part one of the Notice of Violation # 93-38, was issued for the operator's failure to submit designs for the primary road drainage on the 800 feet of #1 fan road and the 2 to 300 feet of road to the new mine portals on east side of the Soldier Canyon. Design data for the #1 fan road was difficult to find in the mine plan because it is spread throughout the permit document. After we finally came to the conclusion that the design had not been submitted for approval, the operator said that apparently the design was never totally put together because of plans to modify the road somewhat to accomodate the construction of a proposed preparation plant. In addition, he said that they knew it would not meet design specs under the old reg road classification system, that set roads aside as a Class I, II or III road. Under the old system, the road grade is too steep, and the canyon where it is built would not be wide enough to accomodate swithbacks needed to alter the grade. After some discussion, it was determined that the road would now meet the design limitations on a primary road. In

addition, the road change as proposed for the prep plant installation has been dropped because the plant proposal has been dropped. The road to the new portal site again was temporarily constructed for access but it did not have designs submitted for the Primary road designation. They have to have a design for ditches\cross drains and ditch relief drains that will safely handle a 10 year 6 hour event.

Part two of the violation was issued for the operator's failure to have a professional engineers certification for as built designs on the above named roads.

Part three of the Violation was issued for a mine plan deficiency. Another company, REI, (Resource Enterprises Incorporated) phone #584-2450, who is owned by Terratek (phone number 584-2400) works in the mine as a separate entity for the purposes of bleeding off methane gas from coal to be mined. One of the above ground collection sites, the middle degasification pad, that is not in the mine permit as a mine related disturbance, has a set of three transformers that are fed off of one of the mine substations. Dave Spillman said that the transformers are not used by the mine but instead are for the exclusive use of the degasification company. Initially it was my understanding that the transformers fed power into the mine at that point. In addition, that power lead then tied into an underground system where the power was used by the degasification company as well as the mine. That being the case, the above ground site should be permitted as a disturbance and should be managed as such. Apparently this was not the case because Mr. Spillman said that I misunderstood his explanation of the function and design of the area. He said that the power from their main substation that feeds these three transformers is not used in the mine. In addition, it is not fed into the mine but instead is used for powering a motor in the station used to draw gases out of the mine. The power lead from the substation to the transformers is not identified in the permit, in addition, there is no narrative as to the delivery or use of that power. That being the case, the State issued the third part of this violation for the lack of coverage of how this system is provided energy and how the two are connected.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The mine has been purchased by Southern Utah Fuels, another coal mining company in the state. The final paperwork was completed through the corporate entities, a permit transfer was processed by the Division, and as this inspection progressed the official crossover was completed 12:01 AM on the 16th of September. The parent company, Sunoco, has divested themselves of other coal mining properties in other

states as well. I was told by company officials that several investors were interested in the mine, prior to this takeover. As to the future of the property, there were a number of speculative comments but there was no official word from the new owner. Representatives of the new owner were on the property meeting with people from the mine during the inspection but they did not make any comments to me about the future of the mine or the production of or changes thereof of coal being made at the mine.

Mining is still done with conventional miners. Mine run coal is stored in a bin at the mine or on the ground when the bin is full. About a half million tons per year\25,000 tpd is produced with two production and a maintenance shift out of the Rock canyon and Sunnyside seams. The unblended coal is transported via truck over a State Route to their permitted loadout facility. Development rock is left in the mine. There is a permitted processing waste disposal site but it has never been used because the processing plant proposal and construction was dropped.

The mine plan and related documents were available for review at the mine. Of those, it was noted that their mining permit, ACT-007-018 expires, February 3, 1997. The NPDES permit for the mine, UT-0023680, for 7 permitted discharge points with three mine water discharges, expires, March 31, 1996. Water discharge records were posted for the NPDES points for August of 1993. Mine water is to be sampled on a monthly basis. Additional samples of the discharges for September were taken but the lab being used by the company had not sent the results back yet. No discharge violations in the records were observed for the 1993. Field collection data was available for those samples. The Spill Prevention and Containment Plan was recently updated by a professional engineer from the company as of the 14th of January, 1992. The most current quarterly pond self inspections were completed, August 9, 1993. The pond certifications for the year were completed September 9, 1993 for the sediment pond and the sewage lagoon. The certificate of public liability insurance policy #, TLJSLG-186-T908-A-91, was issued by the Travelers Indemity Company for the Soldier Canyon mine with the proper coverage for comprehensive and general liability. It was issued May 7, 1991 with coverage provided until written notice is issued from Travelers Insurance to the company and the Division. The mine subsidence monitoring report for 1992 was submitted to the Division on the 26th of April, 1993. There was little or no subsidence reported for the year. Ground water monitoring data which includes in mine monitoring is being reported. There is some discussion as to the integrity of the in mine monitoring. Of the 265,000,000 gallons of mine water discharged for 1992, only about 150,000,000 gallons can be accounted for through in mine

monitoring points. As it stands now, the company must identify 5 gallon per minute flows that are sustained over a thirty day period. They have five points identified in the mine that discharge 5 gallons per minute or more. When asked about the difference, Mr. Spillman said that parts of the mine are closed off, thus not accesible for monitoring, in addition, water is moved into sumps to others and when not needed, it is discharged. I said that they should establish new monitoring points to better reflect the water loss and gains in the mine. Inspector Falvey concurs with my evaluation as well as agreeing that something should be done to balance the data. Water being discharged from the mine is monitored by a computerized system.

*Is there a regulatory basis for this?
Is there a change required to PDC or CHIA?*

The greater percentage of the surface water monitoring stations were checked to verify flow and location in relation to the mine plan requirements. The Upper Soldier Creek station flow was determined with a flowmeter. (pygmy) Field notes were cross referenced with the previous quarters result and this quarter a year ago. In all cases, it seemed apparent that the data collected did reflect our findings in the field. Cross sections were developed in the field of the Soldier Creek flow site and flow data was recorded in three different locations across the drainage. (flow was .7 cfs) The only comment I would make regarding this site is that the location of the site is changed to meet the conditions encountered in the field. I believe this will skew the data somewhat but it is acceptable.

Mine permit boundary signs were noted as we checked the monitoring stations.

Ground water monitoring site, 32-1, a steel 2 inch casing was locked and was being maintained. The comment was made that the reclaimed perimeter was being grazed. This area should be replanted or fenced to protect the site until the reveg can be established. The comment was also made that some of these areas may have to be permitted as disturbance for bonding and reclamation purposes. A surface water station in Soldier Creek just below the Pine Canyon drainage inflow was checked (#10 spring). The spring is on the west side of the drainage is the monitoring station. It has a distinct egg (sulfur) odor and is precipitating Manganese (dark black brackish flow) to the extent that flowstone is being formed along the discharge path. (flow is about 4 gpm and has a pH of 8.7) The comment was made that the Pine Canyon inflow into Soldier Creek should be monitored. This is not a requirement at this time. There is a degasification processing station in the Canyon just above the inflow which could affect water quality should there be a spill. Spring #8 in Pine Canyon was flowing about 8 gpm. This spring is monitored for flow in a pipe outfall that goes under the access road for the area. Samples

for quality are taken upstream from that point. The comment was made that cattle in the area are tracking in and out of the flow which in turn will bias the quality data. That being the case, an effort should be made to move as close to the source as possible and if needed provide protection to limit animal disturbance in that area. Mr. Spillman said that the data would be affected only once through the monitoring year by the livestock. This is not acceptable. Spring # 4 was flowing at about 2 gpm. Again cattle were noted in the area. Surface water station G-2, the head water area for Spring Canyon was running about 10 gpm. Monitoring well, 10-2, is a 6 inch steel casing within a 12 inch top casing. It was locked and is being maintained. We did not monitor the standing level of the water in the well. Spring #21 was flowing about 10 gpm. The comment was made that this could be and perhaps should be listed as a creek drainage instead of being noted as a spring because of the development of the drainage channel. Again the water was monitored for flow near the access road and quality data was picked up, up stream. Cattle were again in the drainage. Spring #15, is located below a fairly good sized cattle tank. The tank was discharging but water from the two is not allowed to co-mingle because the monitoring location is above the inflow. The flow was about 2 gpm. Again cattle were in the drainage. The mine water discharge, 003, was sampled. The conductivity was noted as 1254 umhos, iwth a pH of 8.11 and a temperature of 58.4 degrees. The monitoring well locations for the proposed processing waste disposal area were checked. All were 6 inch steel casings with locking caps and appeared to be maintained. These sites have been dropped from the monitoring requirements via Division approval because the baseline data has been gathered. The wells noted were, MW-3M, dMW-1M, MW-1C and MW-2M. It should be noted that a wetland is located below the Anderson reservoir which is in the drainage below the proposed head of hollow fill waste site. The comment was made that the access road into the well location which passes the Reservoir should be reclaimed or blocked to prevent local access. Sections of filter fabric fence were noted in gully crossings. The questions was asked about maintaining them, I said that the road must meet effluent limitations. Maintenance is needed to insure that it is being done. Close it off or redo the road if the fence is pulled out.

The topsoil storage down canyon from the mine was checked. The comment was made in my last oversight inspection that the area did not have a good cover crop. Yellow sweet clover is now established. A topsoil sign was needed for the piles, it was put up prior to the end of the inspection per the request of Inspector Falvey.

No problems were noted during the inspection of the surface facilities. But a few comments were made. The transformer

and switch box on the upper pad could be moved to a more secure area to insure no petrochemical loss from unexpected discharges. The oil storage building has a drain in the middle of the pad, this should be closed. Several fifty gallon barrels were noted near the rock dust drop, these should be moved in to prevent rust and the potential of spill. A barrel was noted on the lower pad in the truck turnaround area, this should be moved to a more secure location. Of the ditches, culverts, and drop drains on the mine, the only comment made was that coal dust accumulation was noted in the head of the drop drain on State Route 53 across from the main shop. The comment was made that it should be cleared. Erosion was noted on the embankment of the sediment pond. It is a part of the Creek drainage, storm flows in the past have meandered against the toe of the embankment. This should be watched for maintenance. The sediment level in the sed pond is nearing cleanout requirement. The question was asked about storage for dewatering and eventual disposal. One of the comments was that in mine disposal was discussed but MSHA regs limit disposal of high coal percentages of waste back in the mine.

The #1 and #2 fan were operating during the inspection.

The sewage treatment lagoon was checked. The design of the access road into the area was in question. I was not able to find it in mine plan at the mine. It has been located. A couple of culverts along the route appear to be undersized. I would suggest that they be reviewed for adequacy. The road was once a county road for access into the Canyon. Erosion near the head of the lagoon was noted in an earlier DOGM inspection report, this has been addressed.

The degasification of the mine was discussed in detail. I questioned the requirement to permit the three surface sites. The operator maintains that the company is a separate entity, he gave me phone numbers of their company officials as noted earlier in this report. I made the comment that the corporate structure would be checked for ties. Mr. Spillman said that the mine pays for power to run the operation but does not receive royalties for the gas generated. As I understand it, horizontal holes are drilled in the blocks of coal developed ahead of the miner. The gas is collected, and crawn to the surface in three different locations. It is then sent to a central location in Pine Canyon, dried and tapped into another companies gas line that goes through the area. The question was asked about MSHA requirement to degas the mine prior to production. the comment made by Mr. Spillman was that it was not a requirement. I have not checked all of the leads in this matter and would make the reservation that it will be done for verification and enforcement action if necessary.

MINESITE INSPECTION NARRATIVE

7

The comment was made about roof bolts in a field below the mine during this inspection as well as during the previous inspection. These should be removed.