



The State of Utah

Department of
Natural ResourcesDivision of
Oil, Gas & MiningROBERT 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
Company	Mike Davis	
Other	Erik Petersen	

Inspection Report

Permit Number:	C0410002
Inspection Type:	TECHNICAL
Inspection Date:	Wednesday, September 22, 2004
Start Date/Time:	9/22/2004 10:30:00 AM
End Date/Time:	9/22/2004 3:30:00 PM
Last Inspection:	Thursday, May 20, 2004

Inspector: Steven Fluke, Environmental Scientist IIWeather: Sunny, calm, cool ~60 FInspectionID Report Number: 429Accepted by: whedberg
11/2/2004

Permitee: **CANYON FUEL COMPANY LLC**
 Operator: **CANYON FUEL COMPANY LLC**
 Site: **SUFCO MINE**
 Address: **397 S 800 W, SALINA UT 84654**
 County: **SEVIER**
 Permit Type: **PERMANENT COAL PROGRAM**
 Permit Status: **ACTIVE**

Current Acreages

24,632.95	Total Permitted
27.36	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:

I visited the East Fork of Box Canyon (EFB) to observe the first day of repairs to the stream channel from damage caused by subsidence. I met Mike Davis (SUFCO) and Erik Petersen (Petersen Hydrologic) to observe the repairs being conducted by Clay Mecham and three helpers. They were repairing the stream channel with picks, shovels, and bentonite and regaining much of the flow that had gone subsurface due to cracks in the underlying bedrock. The repairs were documented by me using a videorecorder and Mike Davis took photographs. We also took a look at the new weather station at the head of EFB, the repair of subsidence cracks above the Elusive Peacock Shelter, and the helicopter assisted exploration boring for the SITLA Muddy Tract. Photos can be found in the DOGM database.

Inspector's Signature

Date Wednesday, October 13, 2004

Steven Fluke, Environmental Scientist II
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.

Permit Number: C0410002
 Inspection Type: TECHNICAL
 Inspection Date: Wednesday, September 22, 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 performance standard listed below.
4. Provide a brief status report for all pending enforcement actions, permit conditions, Division Orders, and amendments.

	Evaluated	Not Applicable	Comment	Enforcement
1. Permits, Change, Transfer, Renewal, Sale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Signs and Markers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Topsoil	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.a Hydrologic Balance: Diversions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.b Hydrologic Balance: Sediment Ponds and Impoundments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.c Hydrologic Balance: Other Sediment Control Measures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Explosives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Disposal of Excess Spoil, Fills, Benches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Coal Mine Waste, Refuse Piles, Impoundments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Noncoal Waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Protection of Fish, Wildlife and Related Environmental Issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Slides and Other Damage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Contemporaneous Reclamation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Backfilling And Grading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Revegetation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Subsidence Control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Cessation of Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.a Roads: Construction, Maintenance, Surfacing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.b Roads: Drainage Controls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Other Transportation Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Support Facilities, Utility Installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. AVS Check	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Air Quality Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Bonding and Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.d Hydrologic Balance: Water Monitoring

Pines Tract Weather Station: A solar powered weather station was installed the first week of September at the head of the EFB stream channel approximately one hundred yards downstream of the Joe's Mill ponds. The weather station was part of the EFB 3LP and 4LP mitigation and was installed to better document precipitation in the EFB watershed. The station consists of a self-emptying rain gauge, thermometer, and datalogger. The data can be downloaded by laptop computer on site. A fence has been constructed around the weather station to keep it from being damaged by cattle.

10. Slides and Other Damage

Repair of EFB stream channel fractures: We observed the beginning of the repair of the stream channel by Clay Mecham and three helpers using picks, shovels, and bentonite. They were able to regain approximately two-thirds of the subsurface flow in just a couple of hours by breaking up fractured bedrock, filling cracks with bentonite and sand, and channeling the flow in places. I videorecorded some of the repair (approx. 10 min.) and Mike Davis took photographs that have been included in the DOGM database. We expected to have to experiment with different ways of regaining surface flow, but, we were pleased with how quickly fractures were filled and the flow was 'teased' downstream through various hand-tool methods. After a couple of hours we didn't feel the need to watch the progress since the workers were using repair methods that seemed to be working well. Fifteen bags of bentonite powder at 50 lbs each had been used in the stream channel by 12:30 pm and the crew headed back to the trucks for lunch and to carry more bags to the creek. Mike, Erik, and I went to look at the new weather station and the repaired fractures above the Elusive Peacock area. The repairs looked good and no noticeable settling had occurred since the fractures were filled.

22. Other

Exploration - SITLA Muddy Tract: Mike Davis and I visited the helicopter assisted drilling site for the SITLA lease of the Muddy Tract. We could drive to within ~75 feet of the boring on a minor dirt road, although the rig and equipment was reportedly flown in. A water line followed the road to the site from the staging area off the main F.S. road. Three drillers were manning the reverse-circulation rig that was drilling a 3" diameter boring to an estimated depth of approximately 1,500' bgs. The boring was at a depth of approximately 948' at the time of the visit. Continuous core samples were being collected and logged by a consulting geologist. Mark Bunnell (SUFCA geologist) also stopped by the site while we were there. An emulsifier was being added to the drilling fluid which was contained in a 500 gal. tank except for the area immediately around the boring. No water was being produced and none was being released to the surface. A tarp was placed underneath the rig and diesel pump to act as a berm and for containment of leaks and spills. Overall, the operation was clean and impacts to the surface appeared to be minimized.