State of Utah

Department of Natural Resources

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

Inspection Report

Representatives Present During the Inspection:	
OGM	Priscilla Burton Environmental Scientist III
OGM	David Shaver Manager

Permit Number:	C0070041
Inspection Type:	PARTIAL
Inspection Date:	Tuesday, November 20, 2007
Start Date/Time:	11/20/2007 1:00:00 PM
End Date/Time:	11/20/2007 4:00:00 PM
Last Inspection:	Wednesday, October 31, 2007

Inspector: Priscilla Burton, Environmental Scientist III

Weather: overcast 53 F

InspectionID Report Number: 1468

Accepted by: dhaddock OK
11/26/2007

Permitee: **WEST RIDGE RESOURCES**
Operator: **WEST RIDGE RESOURCES**
Site: **WEST RIDGE MINE**
Address: **PO BOX 1077, PRICE UT 84501**
County: **CARBON**
Permit Type: **PERMANENT COAL PROGRAM**
Permit Status: **ACTIVE**

Current Acreages

6,114.89	**Total Permitted**
29.06	**Total Disturbed**
	Phase I
	Phase II
	Phase III

Mineral Ownership

- [x] **Federal**
- [x] **State**
- [ ] **County**
- [ ] **Fee**
- [ ] **Other**

Types of Operations

- [x] **Underground**
- [ ] **Surface**
- [ ] **Loadout**
- [ ] **Processing**
- [ ] **Reprocessing**

Report summary and status for pending enforcement actions, permit conditions, Division Orders, and amendments:

Observed the reclamation test plots. Tried to locate the Douglas Fir/maple reference area. Reviewed the annual testing requirements of the experimental practice.

Inspector's Signature: Priscilla Burton **Date** Tuesday, November 20, 2007

Priscilla Burton, Environmental Scientist III
Inspector ID Number: 37

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

REVIEW OF PERMIT, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS PERMIT CONDITION REQUIREMENTS

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 Not Applicable.*
   b. *For PARTIAL inspections check only the elements evaluated.*
2. *Document any noncompliance situation by reference the NOV issued at the appropriate performance standard listed below.*
3. *Reference any narratives written in conjunction with this inspection at the appropriate performace standard listed below.*
4. *Provide a brief status report for all pending enforcement actions, permit conditions, Divison Orders, and amendments.*

	Evaluated	Not Applicable	Comment	Enforcement
1. Permits, Change, Transfer, Renewal, Sale	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Signs and Markers	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Topsoil	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.a Hydrologic Balance: Diversions	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.b Hydrologic Balance: Sediment Ponds and Impoundments	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.c Hydrologic Balance: Other Sediment Control Measures	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.d Hydrologic Balance: Water Monitoring	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.e Hydrologic Balance: Effluent Limitations	☐	☐	☐	☐
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 Issues	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Slides and Other Damage	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Contemporaneous Reclamation	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Backfilling And Grading	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Revegetation	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Subsidence Control	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Cessation of Operations	☐	☐	☐	☐
16.a Roads: Construction, Maintenance, Surfacing	☐	☐	☐	☐
16.b Roads: Drainage Controls	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Other Transportation Facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Support Facilities, Utility Installations	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. AVS Check	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Air Quality Permit	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Bonding and Insurance	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Other	☑	☐	☑	☐

22. Other

The Experimental Practice is described in Appendix 2-6. The experimental testplots are shown on Map 2-4. The testplots were "reclaimed" in September 2005 as per Appendix 2-6. (Refer to Inspection Report dated September 6, 2005 for a description of the work. Soil samples of the reclaimed test plots were to have been taken, but results were not received by the Division. The soil samples would have shown the condition of the buried soil immediately after being unearthed. However, the appearance of the reclaimed testplots indicates that there is not an issue with fertility of the reclaimed soil buried for four years. Reclaimed test plots were photographed. The highest percent cover appeared to be on the reclaimed Midfork stockpile area, which is shaded from the western sun. There was no "stinging nettle" on the reclaimed Midfork stockpile area, where previously the "stinging nettle" was rampant. Rather, this nettle seed had been transferred in the surface soil that was "livehauled" to the comparison Midfork Cut Area (refer to Plate 2-4).

The Experimental Practice calls for the reclaimed test plot vegetation to be evaluated annually in June. This annual evaluation has not been conducted. Dave Shaver will arrange for the first evaluation to take place in June 2008, which will be three years after the site reclamation.

The Douglas Fir/ Maple reference area is the comparison area for these test plots. It's location is shown on Plate 3-1. Although we walked from the test plots up to the fork in the drainage, we could not definitely identify the reference area location. The Douglas Fir/Maple location should be identified with a GPS instrument during the June 2008 evaluation.

An Addendum to Appendix 2-6 requires annual soil sampling of fill at locations T1, T2, and T3. The last soil samples were taken in 2001 and analyzed for pH, EC, and $CaCO_3$ percentage. Since the depth of the fill is twenty feet and the depth of sampling is six inches it is doubtful that the sampling will reflect the condition of the buried topsoil. The location of the soil sampling and the necessity for sampling and analysis was discussed.