

α



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREG BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

Inspection Report

Permit Number:	C0410002
Inspection Type:	PARTIAL
Inspection Date:	Wednesday, June 06, 2012
Start Date/Time:	06/06/2012 8:00:00 AM
End Date/Time:	06/06/2012 2:00:00 PM
Last Inspection:	Tuesday, April 10, 2012

Inspector: Joe Helfrich,

Weather:

InspectionID Report Number: 3123

Accepted by: dhaddock
06/26/2012

Representatives Present During the Inspection:	
OGM	April Abate
OGM	Joe Helfrich
OGM	Daron Haddock
Federal	Tom Lloyd
Federal	Steve Falk
Company	Patrick Collins
Company	Erik Petersen
Company	Leland Roberts
Company	Mike Davis

Permittee: **CANYON FUEL COMPANY**
 Operator: **CANYON FUEL COMPANY**
 Site: **SUFCO MINE**
 Address: **597 SOUTH SR24, SALINA UT 84654**
 County: **SEVIER**
 Permit Type: **PERMANENT COAL PROGRAM**
 Permit Status: **ACTIVE**

Current Acreages

720.48	Total Permitted
48.43	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:

The purpose of this field visit was to discuss the proposal to mine a block of coal beneath the South Fork of Quitcupah Creek. SUFCO plans to submit an amendment for permitting this action by late summer 2012. Longwall mining beneath the South Fork of Quitcupah is estimated to take place in the fall of 2013. Other trip attendees included: Amanda Richard, SUFCO - Sue Wiler, BLM - Dave Horsely and Rick Wilde, DWRi

Discussed establishing baseline monitoring programs for springs and surface water locations and for areas identified as riparian habitat.

Inspector's Signature:

Joe Helfrich,

Date

Thursday, Jun 07, 2012



Inspector ID Number: 1

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210, PO Box 145801, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5801
 Note: This inspection report does not constitute an affidavit of compliance with the regulatory program of the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining.
 Telephone (801) 538-5340 • Facsimile (801) 359-3940 • TTY (801) 538-7458 • www.ogm.utah.gov

OIL, GAS & MINING

Permit Number: C0410002
Inspection Type: PARTIAL
Inspection Date: Wednesday, June 06, 2012

Inspection Continuation Sheet

Page 2 of 5

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.b Hydrologic Balance: Sediment Ponds and Impoundments

Two stockponds identified with Water Right Identification numbers were observed and evaluated for their significance. WR-94-115 and 94-116 held by the Forest Service. Neither of these ponds appeared to retain much or any water and did not appear to be very functional. Both the Division and the Forest Service agreed that these ponds could easily be relocated as wildlife enhancement measure after the subsurface area has been mined out. USFS was not overly concerned with water loss because the upstream source that feeds the South Fork of Quitchupah is not being undermined. BLM has documented that the typical angle of draw from longwall mining in the Wasatch Plateau ranges from 12-20 degrees. This is the tension zone where effects from subsidence are expected.

4.d Hydrologic Balance: Water Monitoring

All springs that were identified with a water right number were observed in the headwater areas of S. Fork of Quitchupah Creek. The group hiked up the drainages. Most were small trickles of water less than 0.5 gal minute. The group did not hike down into Quitchupah Canyon. The canyon was reported to be dry but was flowing just a few weeks ago. The company has included three monitoring points in the S. Fork of Quitchupah Creek to monitor flow. According to measurements taken along the reach, there has been no reported increase in flow that would indicate that flow is being increase by a groundwater contribution. A series of seeps were identified further downstream of surface water sampling point 006A. It was agreed upon that these seeps would all be added to the monitoring plan. One would be collected for chemistry parameters while the others would be collected for field parameters. Since these seeps were so close to the border of the panel, the Division felt it was important that they all be monitored.

9. Protection of Fish, Wildlife and Related Environmental Issues

The tour included a site visit to the riparian area located approximately 1/4 mile upstream from the access road. Cattle were already in the riparian area approximately three weeks prior to when the grazing permittee is allowed to begin grazing on the forest. Since the grazing permittee is not taking measures to protect the springs, (fencing and maintenance typically required in the terms of the grazing permit), the cattle have impacted the integrity of these water sources in the area above the proposed mining. Given these circumstances it is apparent that the riparian area and associated water sources are and will continue to be impacted unless the Forest Service and the grazing permittee take appropriate measures to protect the integrity of this area. Vegetation and water monitoring will be of marginal significance as long as the area continues to be impacted in this manner. The permittee should consult with the Division, DWR and the FWS in developing mitigation plans for active nests within 1/2 mile of potential impacts from subsidence.

10. Slides and Other Damage

The South fork of Quitchpah headwaters area is a grassy riparian habitat with a small stream channel as the drainage moves downstream (to the southeast) it becomes a steep incised canyon made up of near vertical walls of Castlegate sandstone. No springs or vegetation were observed on the canyon sidewalls which would be indicative of springs originating in the Castlegate. The rim of the canyon was Castlegate with no Price River formation to act as cover. The risks identified to the canyon would be rockfall from subsidence cracking, or cracking of the stream bed. Mitigation proposed included sealing of subsidence cracks and piping of the surface water in the channel.

22. Other

Mitigation plans for the shelter site are currently under review by Bob Leonard, archaeologist for the Fish Lake Ntl Forest.