

0025

Document Information Form

Mine Number: C/007/022

File Name: Incoming

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company N/A

Date Sent: MARCH 7, 1983

Explanation:

MINE SITE EVALUATION

INSPECTION REPORT

cc:

File in: C/007/022 1983 Incoming

Refer to:

- Confidential
- Shelf
- Expandable

Date _____ For additional information

0025

File Act/007/022 07
510

Office of Surface Mining
MINE SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION REPORT

MAR 07 1983

DIVISION OF

INSPECTOR NUMBER 242

INSPECTION DATE: 2/3/83

I. MINE SITE

- 1. Permittee Beaver Creek Coal Co.
- 2. Permittee Address
P.O. Box AU
Price, UT 84501
- 3. Location of Mine
a. County CARBON
b. State UTAH
- 4. Name of Mine C. V. SPUR
- 5. Telephone _____
- 6. Date of Last State
Inspection 1/18/82 on file
- 7. Permit No. ACT/007/022

MSHA No. In Report

OSM No. _____

- 8. Status (check one)
a. Active
b. In reclamation
c. Inactive
d. Abandoned
- 9. Type of Facility
a. Surface
b. Underground
c. Other -
Specify prep plant
- 10. Steep Slope
Yes _____
No X
- 11. Mountain Top Removal
Yes _____
No X
- 12. Prime Farm Land
Yes _____
No X

II. TYPE OF OSM INSPECTION

A. Complete Inspection: Check appropriate box

- 1. Statistical Sample Inspection
- 2. Others (citizen complaint inspections or second phase/
assistance inspections - specify.)

B. Other-Than-Complete-Inspection: Check appropriate box and
reason for inspection.

- 1. Statistical Sample Follow-up (date of Complete
Inspection _____.)

File in:

- Confidential
- Shelf
- Expandable

Refer to Record No 0025 Date 3-7-83

In C 007/022, 1983 Incoming

For additional information

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

B. Performance standards that assure reclamation quality and timeliness:

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

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

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

- 4 1. Hours travel to and from site
- 160 2. Acreage of permit
- 6 hrs 3. Inspection time (on site)
- 2 hrs 4. Permit review time (on site)
- 4 hrs Permit review time in office
- 3 hrs 5. Report-writing time

Jodie Merriman 3-3-83
Signature Date

Jodie L. Merriman
Print Name of Authorized Representative

[Signature] 3-3-83
Reviewed By Date

GENERAL COMMENTS

This inspection was conducted with Joe Helfrich, UDOGM. Company officials present during this inspection were Dwight Kilpack and James Voorhees.

PERMITS

The following information was available for review at the mine office:

1. The MRP was submitted to UDOGM on 9/24/79 and was amended on 10/23/79. Interim approval was given on 9/24/81. The permanent program application was submitted on 8/20/80. The application was reviewed and the ACR dated 4/3/81 has not been addressed by the company. The company has committed to responding to the ACR by 3/31/83.
2. The company submitted for a minor modification on 9/17/82, which involves the addition of a new haulroad and coal stockpile and the removal of Pond #4. Pond #5 will be enlarged to accommodate the removal of Pond #4. A letter from the Division, dated 10/20/82 gave approval, with seven stipulations. All stipulations have been addressed except no. 4. Stipulation no. 4 requires that filter Pond #6 be enlarged. Although this modification will not change the amount of surface drainage entering Pond #6, it was felt that the enlargement was needed for overall drainage control.
3. The company received approval from the Division on 7/30/82 to bury a diesel fuel tank.
4. NPDES Permit No. UT-0023949 was renewed last September and expires in December 1986. The company is allowed to discharge from filter Pond #6 for emergency dewatering of the plant. Normally, prep plant water is recycled.
5. The following MSHA ID numbers have been assigned:

#42-01444 is for the washing plant and loadout.

#1211-UT-9-0033 is for the temporary refuse fill site.

#1211-UT-9-0034 is for refuse dumping area #2.
6. A small area exemption, for the area northeast of the pump-house, was submitted to the Division in December. It has not yet been approved.

BONDING

No reclamation bond has been posted with the state. This matter will be addressed during the permanent program permitting process.

TOPSOIL

The topsoil and subsoil stockpiles have been revegetated. Straw bales have been installed to filter runoff from the stockpile area.

HYDROLOGIC BALANCE

Prep plant water is normally recycled from the plant to the water tank overflow, to filter ponds 1, 2, 3; to filter pond #6 and then pumped back to the plant.

Runoff capacity problems have arisen on several occasions because the filter ponds are used also for sediment control. Mr. Jim Smith, of UDOGM has requested that the company submit plans to show that the ponds are adequately sized to accommodate both runoff and prep plant water. At the time of this inspection, the ponds were full due to a problem with the pump. Dwight Kilpack told inspectors that the company is considering installing pipe and risers in each pond so the ponds can be pumped separately. Plans have not been submitted to the Division yet. Makeup water, when needed, is obtained from the French Drain and the Price River.

Another plan the company is considering is building an elongated pond to receive any water from the plant, so that the sediment ponds could be used exclusively for runoff control. Sediment generated from cleaning the ponds is deposited at the refuse disposal area.

Ditches are in need of maintenance as soon as weather conditions allow.

WATER MONITORING

Water monitoring data was available through January. Several wells and a French Drain are monitored monthly.

AIR RESOURCES

According to internal memos in the company's file, the Utah Air Quality Bureau (UAQB) did not require a monitoring plan at C. V. Spur. The prep plant was considered to be a minor source, the only pollutant being fugitive dust. A letter from the Utah Air Conservation Committee, dated 7/17/80, gave approval for the facilities. Evidently, monitoring was conducted during 1981 and on a voluntary basis. Water trucks and MgCl are used to control dust.

These records were reviewed and the highest samples were 496 and 419 obtained in November.