



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

Representatives Present During the Inspection:

OGM	Steve Christensen	Environmental Scientist II
OGM	Joe Helfrich	Environmental Scientist III
Federal	Dale Harber	Forest Geologist
Federal	Steve Rigby	Mining Engineer
Landowner	Mark Reynolds	

Inspection Report

Permit Number:	C0150025
Inspection Type:	TECHNICAL
Inspection Date:	Wednesday, September 20, 2006
Start Date/Time:	9/20/2006
End Date/Time:	9/20/2006
Last Inspection:	Tuesday, August 22, 2006

Inspector: Steve Christensen, Environmental Scientist II

Weather: Winds 10-15 mph gusts, Cloudy, Snow precipitation

InspectionID Report Number: 1086

Accepted by: whedberg

9/29/2006

Permittee: **CO-OP MINING CO**

Operator: **CO-OP MINING CO**

Site: **BEAR CANYON MINE**

Address: **PO BOX 1245, HUNTINGTON UT 84528**

County: **EMERY**

Permit Type: **PERMANENT COAL PROGRAM**

Permit Status: **ACTIVE**

Current Acreages

4,416.18	Total Permitted
40.46	Total Disturbed
	Phase I
	Phase II
	Phase III

Mineral Ownership

- Federal
 State
 County
 Fee
 Other

Types of Operations

- Underground
 Surface
 Loadout
 Processing
 Reprocessing

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

On September 20th, Division personnel Joe Helfrich and Steve Christensen met with Mark Reynolds of C.O.P. Mining Company as well as Dale Harber and Steve Rigby from the USDA Forest Service and BLM at the proposed Bear Canyon Lease expansion site. The purpose of the site visit was to field inspect the Left and Right Fork of Fish Creek within the proposed lease expansion area and determine where these drainages exhibited perennial flow characteristics. Determining the perennial reaches of these drainages was necessary in order to produce a reasonable and prudent water monitoring schedule for the Permittee to implement in light of the proposed mining activity in these areas.

The Left and Right Fork drainages were accessed from the top of the mountain. Both drainages were traversed until perennial flow was identified. GPS data points were gathered at points of interest and observations recorded as to the extent and nature of flow in these drainages.

Inspector's Signature:

Steve Christensen, Environmental Scientist II

Inspector ID Number: 54

Date Wednesday, September 27, 2006

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

Permit Number: C0150025
 Inspection Type: TECHNICAL
 Inspection Date: Wednesday, September 20, 2006

Inspection Continuation Sheet

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 performance 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Signs and Markers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Topsoil	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.a Hydrologic Balance: Diversions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b Hydrologic Balance: Sediment Ponds and Impoundments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.c Hydrologic Balance: Other Sediment Control Measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.d Hydrologic Balance: Water Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.e Hydrologic Balance: Effluent Limitations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Explosives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Disposal of Excess Spoil, Fills, Benches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Coal Mine Waste, Refuse Piles, Impoundments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Noncoal Waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Protection of Fish, Wildlife and Related Environmental Issues	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Slides and Other Damage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Contemporaneous Reclamation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Backfilling And Grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Revegetation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Subsidence Control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Cessation of Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.a Roads: Construction, Maintenance, Surfacing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.b Roads: Drainage Controls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Other Transportation Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Support Facilities, Utility Installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. AVS Check	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Air Quality Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Bonding and Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.d Hydrologic Balance: Water Monitoring

As there are sections of both the Left and Right Fork of Fish Creek that will be undermined, identifying the perennial flow reaches of these drainages was the primary goal of the field inspection. Upon inspection, a side drainage located in T16S R8E S19 NW 1/4 NE 1/4 was located and was flowing at approximately 2-5 gpm at the upslope and approximately 10-15 gpm at the downslope. The side drainage appeared to be the sole source of baseflow to the Left Fork of Fish Creek as the primary channel of the drainage was dry and displayed no evidence of any recent water flow. The Right Fork of Fish Creek was accessed via the Chris Otteson trail at the headwaters of Mud Springs. Mud Springs did not exhibit any evidence of surface or sub-surface flow at the time of the field inspection. Approximately 3/4 of a mile south of Mud Springs, the inspection team traversed due west until the main drainage of the Right Fork of Fish Creek was observed. Upon inspection of the area, it was determined that there were three defined drainages contributing flow to the Right Fork of Fish Creek. At the time of the inspection, the drainages were observed producing flow of approximately 5-10 gpm. These three drainages were observed approximately 1/8th-1/4 mile west of the Right Fork of Fish Creek. GPS coordinates were obtained at the confluences of these drainages. Upon discussions with Mark and Charles Reynolds from C.O.P., it was determined that spring SCC-2 (16-8-18-5) has been identified as the spring source for these side drainages due west of the main channel of the Right Fork of Fish Creek. Spring SCC-2 has been identified as discharging from the Flagstaff Limestone (the upper-most geologic layer in the lease expansion area). These three drainages converge and ultimately discharge into the main channel of the Right Fork of Fish Creek. Although Plate 7-4 of the MRP depicts one channel for the Right Fork of Fish Creek, it was determined that there are in fact three drainages that ultimately contribute flow to the main channel of the Right Fork of Fish Creek.

9. Protection of Fish, Wildlife and Related Environmental Issues

As there are sections of both the Left and Right Fork of Fish Creek that will be undermined, identifying the sources of perennial flow and riparian reaches of these drainages were the focus of the field inspection. The sources of perennial flow in the side drainage of the left fork and right fork are described in section 4d of this report. No riparian vegetation was evident in the left fork from the source of perennial flow to at least 500 yards down slope where it flows over a cliff face. The soil above the cliff to the source is mostly clay and void of vegetation. The right fork as described in section 4d contains riparian vegetation from the sources of perennial flow to approximately the Forest Service boundary. The riparian community was basically confined to the stream channel. Follow up conversations with Dale Harber and Catherine Foster of the FS indicate that riparian communities may extend up to 100' on each side of a stream channel. On September 28, 2006, Mark Reynolds and I met at the PFO to discuss the locations of riparian vegetation above the proposed mine pannels. When plotted on Plate 3-1 the riparian communities would be too small to recognize. Therefore, it was suggested that descriptions of the areas could be included in the text of chapter three.