

0009

Document Information Form

Mine Number: CI 015 017

File Name: Internal

To: DOGM

From:

Person N/A

Company OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING

Date Sent: SEPTEMBER 26, 1983

Explanation:

MINE SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION REPORT.

cc:

File in:
CI 015, 017, Internal

Refer to:
 Confidential
 Shelf
 Expandable

Date _____ For additional information

Office of Surface Mining
MINE SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION REPORT

INSPECTOR NUMBER 0031

INSPECTION DATE 08/03/83

I. MINE SITE

1. Permittee Utah Power and Light
2. Permittee Address
P. O. Box 899
Salt Lake City, UT 84110
3. Location of Mine
a. County EMERY
b. State UTAH
4. Name of Mine DES-BEE-DOVE
5. Telephone _____
6. Date of Last State Inspection 03/17,18/83
7. Permit No. ACT/015/017
42-00988
MSHA No. 42-00082
42-01393
OSM No. _____

8. Status (check one)
a. Active
_____ mation
file Act/015/017
folder #7
_____ and

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 0009 Date _____
In CI 015, 017, Internal
For additional information

RECEIVED
SEP 20 1983

DIVISION OF
OIL, GAS & MINING

Office of Surface Mining
MINE SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION REPORT

INSPECTOR NUMBER 0031

INSPECTION DATE 08/03/83

I. MINE SITE

1. Permittee Utah Power and Light

2. Permittee Address
P. O. Box 899
Salt Lake City, UT 84110

3. Location of Mine
a. County EMERY
b. State UTAH

4. Name of Mine DES-BEE-DOVE

5. *Telephone _____

6. Date of Last State
Inspection 03/17,18/83

7. Permit No. ACT/015/017
42-00988
MSHA No. 42-00082
42-01393
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 _____

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 0009 Date _____

In CL 015, 017, Internal _____
For additional information

RECEIVED
SEP 20 1983

DIVISION OF
OIL, GAS & MINING

- (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>2</u>	1. Run-off control	<u>1</u>	6. Ground water monitoring
<u>1</u>	2. Surface water monitoring	<u>1</u>	7. Haul road maintenance
<u>1</u>	3. Mining within permit boundaries	<u>5</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>1</u>	1. Topsoil handling	<u>1</u>	7. Timing of revegetation
<u>1</u>	2. Backfilling & grading	<u>1</u>	8. Highwall elimination
<u>1</u>	3. Timing of reclamation	<u>5</u>	9. Downslope spoil disposal
<u>1</u>	4. Success of revegetation	<u>1</u>	10. Post mining land use
<u>1</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 Program Narrative Under "Hydrologic Balance"

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

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

Frank Atencio
Signature

9/22/83
Date

FRANK ATENCIO

Print Name of Authorized Representative

[Signature]
Reviewed By

9-20-83
Date

GENERAL COMMENTS

Mr. Val Payne and Mr. Dale Grange of Emery Mining Company accompanied the OSM inspector during this inspection.

PERMITS

All required permits were available for review at the mine office. A copy of a response to an Apparent Completeness Review (ACR) dated 7/13/83 was also on hand.

On an inspection conducted on 3/17 and 18, 1983 by a DOGM inspector, it was discovered that the sediment basin for the road to the pumphouse and a portion of the pumphouse road were not included in a Special Use Permit granted to UP&L on 2/10/77. DOGM is still awaiting word from the U. S. Forest Service District Office on a decision for a special use permit.

BONDING

A \$100,000 Fireman's Fund Insurance Company Bond dated 7/16/80, #6356487 was posted.

HYDROLOGIC BALANCE

NAOC # 83-4-1-1 was issued by the State's inspector on 3/31/83. This notice concerned a problem of water ponding along the east side of the parking lot pad posing potential erosion problems to the downslope area. Since then the entire pad has been asphalted and a concrete curb is being placed along the outer edge. During this inspection there was one area where the asphalt had cracked and some slumpage had occurred. The operator said this area would be repoured and graded as soon as it dried out. In the meantime a temporary gravel berm had been placed around the broken area. A drainage culvert will also be installed to drain water from the east side of the pad.

During this inspection it was noted that the entrance to the beehive portal which serves as a drain needed to be cleaned and accumulated sediment removed.

The operator was unable to provide approval documentation during this inspection from the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) for the discharge of water from the surface into the Beehive Mine portals. The DOGM inspector had requested that the operator obtain such documentation during his inspection of the Des-Bee-Dove on March 17 and 18, 1983 in order to comply with UMC 817.55(g). Ten-Day Notice #83-2-31-1 was issued to the State on September 9, 1983 in order to get this matter resolved.

While coming down the main access and haul road, a small pile of coal was visible near the roadside. The coal pile was placed next to the bank of an ephemeral stream which occurs near the haul road east of the pumphouse area. The operator explained that the coal pile consisted of pre-law coal fines and that it had been there for quite some time. The State inspector has been notified of the existence of this coal pile and he will try to determine its origin. OSM is to be notified of the State inspector's finding.

There had been no discharge from the sediment pond.

SLIDES AND OTHER DAMAGE

A slope failure took place at the mine site during the Spring of 1983. In order to stabilize the slope it was necessary to cut and fill various portions of the slope. Also the conveyor belt and guard rail needed to be removed during construction. The slope appeared to have been stabilized and a concrete foundation had been built for the conveyor belt. All work seemed to be progressing well. It was pointed out to the operator, however, that the guard railing that had been removed appeared to have been placed inadvertently in the drainage way which serves the upper Beehive/Little Dove pad. The operator stated this was a temporary measure and that the guard rail would be removed and installed the following week. There was no sign of runoff having occurred outside the permit area as a result of this obstruction.