State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
PO Box 145801
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-7223 (TDD)

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

July 28, 1998

TO: Minerals File

FROM: Tony Gallegos, Reclamation Engineer aaG

RE: Site Inspection, Crown Asphalt Corporation (Crown), Asphalt Ridge Mine, M/047/032, Uintah County, Utah

Date of Inspection: June 29, 1998
Time of Inspection: 1700 - 1900
Conditions: Sunny, hot
Participants: Rick Hoggan; Craig Cloward, Randy Cloward, Crown Asphalt; Tony Gallegos, and Lynn Kunzler, DOGM

Purpose of Inspection: To examine the current operations at this site

This inspection turned out to be more of a meeting at Crown's trailer located onsite. The focus of the meeting was the permitting requirements of the Division as they would apply to this operation and the pre-existing disturbances. The pre-existing conditions at the mine site include an existing pit and highwall and limited topsoil salvage from these disturbed areas. Crown wanted to know how these pre-existing conditions would affect their reclamation responsibilities at the site.

We first discussed the boundary of the permit area. The issues related to the permit area were the property ownership boundary and the disturbed area or the bonded area boundary. At the time of this inspection, Uintah County was mining asphalt in the pit and Mr. Allred was also mining on the private portion of the pit. The permit boundary is generally a boundary which encompasses all the mining related disturbances for the operation. The disturbed area boundary or bonded area boundary may be identical to the permit boundary or be a subset of the permit area. The property ownership boundary may be identical to the permit boundary or the permit boundary may be a subset of the ownership area. The mining disturbance must not exceed the bonded area.

Crown has not yet initiated mining of the asphalt materials. Their main focus at this time is on completion of the operating plant. Crown has contracted with a subcontractor, C.E. Entry, to assemble the operating plant onsite. The assembly of this plant is behind schedule and that is why Crown has not initiated mining.

Crown raised the question of how much topsoil would they have to salvage in the new expansion areas? Ideally, they should salvage all topsoil available. There will be some point in the soil profile where the material salvaged wouldn't necessarily be topsoil but it would be better than the asphalt material. The Division's rules do not have a minimum depth of topsoil to salvage. The depth

or volume of topsoil to salvage is based on the site specific conditions. It's possible that Division staff would need to visit the site when Crown is working in the expansion area to examine the soil profile and determine the cutoff between topsoil to be salvaged and overburden materials.

Other topsoil related questions were where to stockpile topsoil and was there any topsoil currently stockpiled on the site? In response, Crown could stockpile topsoil any place convenient, preferably close to the area where the topsoil would be used for reclamation. In addition, the topsoil stockpile should be stabilized by seeding, as soon as it will not be disturbed. This seeding will help keep the soil viable and help stabilize the stockpile against erosion. With regard to the question of topsoil currently stockpiled, I believe there was very little overburden or soils previously stockpiled.

Another question raised by Crown was where to locate their waste pile or the overburden pile? They should place the waste material in the location described in the current mine plan. Preferably the overburden should be placed near the area where it will be used for reclamation. Ideally, they would direct haul overburden from the removal area to an area being reclaimed. They should avoid placing the overburden in any drainages, or placing the materials outside of the disturbed area boundary.

Crown asked if it was acceptable to place the reject sands from their separation process back in the pit. The response was yes, this was the approved use of the reject sands. Ideally they would place these sands in the pit, followed by overburden and then topsoil. Crown asked about using the topsoil as the visual berm. This was considered acceptable, as long as the stockpiled soil material was seeded for stabilization and used in reclamation.

Crown asked about Uintah County mining within their permit area, and who would the Division consider the responsible party for disturbances or deviations from the mine plan created by the County. In response, the Division considers Crown to be the operator of record and the permittee and any deviations from the mine plan would reflect upon Crown. In the case of some deviation from the approved plan or other compliance issue, the Division would bring these issues to Crown's attention and Crown would have to remedy them. Crown could work out the remedy details with the County or Allred who would be considered as subcontractors working under Crown within the permit area.

Crown asked if there was any County owned property within the permit area? This was unknown at the time. It was suggested that Crown review the terms of their business agreement with the County with respect to mining of asphalt.

Crown has been the focus of some recent public concern about dust, truck traffic, and speeding vehicles on the road near the residential area. It seems Crown is being blamed for a lot of these problems, even if they are not the parties currently mining or creating the dust. A majority of the traffic related concerns are possibly due to the subcontractors and their crews.

Due to the duration of the discussions and lateness of the hour, the mine site was not examined at this time.

jb
cc: Rick Hoggan, Crown Asphalt
m47-32.ins