0044

The State of Utah

Department of Natural Resources

Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

ROBERT L. MORGAN
Executive Director

LOWELL P. BRAXTON
Division Director

OLENE S. WALKER
Governor

GAYLE F. McKEACHNIE
Lieutenant Governor

Representatives Present During the Inspection:	
OGM	Steven Fluke Environmental Scientist II
OGM	Joe Helfrich Environmental Scientist III

Inspection Report

Permit Number:	C0150032
Inspection Type:	TECHNICAL
Inspection Date:	Thursday, November 11, 2004
Start Date/Time:	11/11/2004 9:30:00 AM
End Date/Time:	11/11/2004 3:30:00 PM
Last Inspection:	

Inspector: Steven Fluke, Environmental Scientist II

Weather: Partly cloudy, cool ~40 to 50 F, calm

InspectionID Report Number: 469

Accepted by: whedberg
12/15/2004

Permitee: **GENWAL RESOURCES INC**
Operator: **GENWAL RESOURCES INC**
Site: **CRANDALL CANYON MINE**
Address: **PO BOX 1077, PRICE UT 84501**
County: **EMERY**
Permit Type: **PERMANENT COAL PROGRAM**
Permit Status: **ACTIVE**

Current Acreages

5,195.80	Total Permitted
10.70	Total Disturbed
	Phase I
	Phase II
	Phase III

Mineral Ownership

- [x] Federal
- [ ] 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:

Joe Helfrich and I hiked into the unnamed canyon located between Crandall Canyon and Blind Canyon in the Huntington Creek Canyon area as part of our review of the Crandall Canyon Mine 120-acre addition IBC. The purpose of the visit was to observe the characteristics of the stream, springs, and vegetation associated with both. This was the first chance we had to visit the area since the IBC was assigned on October 22, 2004. Because of the early winter conditions, two to three inches of snow covered the ground in shady areas including much of the stream channel. We also observed a cave located within the Starpoint Formation approximately 500 feet up the right fork of the creek. The cave was not mentioned as a potential archeological site in the IBC. However, follow-up conversations with the Forest Service and the consultant that prepared the cultural resource survey for the area, John Senilius, revealed that the cave had been examined and determined not to have any cultural or historic value. No photos are available from this trip.

Inspector's Signature Steven Fluke, Environmental Scientist II

Date Tuesday, November 30, 2004

Inspector ID Number: 53

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

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210, PO Box 145801, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5801
telephone (801) 538-5340 facsimile (801) 359-3940 TTY (801) 538-7223 *www.ogm.utah.gov*

Utah! *Where ideas connect*

Permit Number: C0150032
Inspection Type: TECHNICAL
Inspection Date: Thursday, November 11, 2004

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 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	☐	☐	☑	☐

4.d Hydrologic Balance: Water Monitoring

The No-Name Creek was flowing less than 20 gpm at its mouth and was frozen beyond approximately 1/4 mile upstream. No springs were observed hiking to the confluence of the right and left forks. We hiked up the right fork to the point where we believed we had reached spring SP-22 based on the location presented in the Petersen Hydrologic report and an icefall within the channel. Riparian vegetation was evident in places within the creek channel by the presence of willows.

9. Protection of Fish, Wildlife and Related Environmental Issues

Vegetation types included riparian, conifer, mountain brush, sagebrush-grass, and Pinyon Juniper-Mountain Brush. It was noted in the Technical analysis that plate 3-2 should be revised to accurately reflect these vegetation types.

22. Other

We observed a cave within sandstone located at the top of the Starpoint Formation approximately 500 feet up the right fork of No-Name (Shingle) Creek. The cave was approximately 60 feet across and 14 feet tall at the mouth and was approximately 50 feet deep. The center of the mouth of the cave was within the creek, but the gradient appeared to be steep enough that water would cascade over the opening. I did not observe any signs that water had backwashed into the cave. The cave floor was mostly covered by sandstone slabs up to six inches thick that had spalled from the ceiling. I did not observe any signs of digging in the silty sand floor of the cave where it was not covered by spalled slabs. No springs or signs of water flow were observed although the back wall of the cave was damp near the floor. The cave looked undisturbed to me, although there was an old soup can on the floor. The application for the IBC included a cultural resource survey and inventory of the proposed 120 acre lease addition. The survey was prepared by Senco-Phenix, a private consulting firm. The survey findings indicated that there were no known cultural resources located within the proposed lease addition. According to the author, John Senulius, the cave was a geologic feature and did not have any cultural or historic value.