



**PERMIT INFORMATION**

<b>Permit Number:</b> C-1996-084 <b>Mine Name:</b> Lorencito Canyon Mine <b>Operator:</b> New Elk Coal Company, LLC <b>Operator Address:</b> Mr. Louis Head 12250 Highway 12 Weston, CO 81091	<b>County:</b> Las Animas <b>Operation Type:</b> Surface <b>Permit Status:</b> Permanent Cessation <b>Ownership:</b> Private
	<b>Operator Representative Present:</b>  Nick Mason
<b>Operator Representative Signature: (Field Issuance Only)</b>	

**INSPECTION INFORMATION**

<b>Inspection Start Date:</b> November 9, 2017 <b>Inspection Start Time:</b> 07:00 <b>Inspection End Date:</b> <b>Inspection End Time:</b>	<b>Inspection Type:</b> Coal Partial Inspection <b>Inspection Reason:</b> Normal I&E Program <b>Weather:</b> Clear
<b>Joint Inspection Agency:</b>  None	<b>Joint Inspection Contacts:</b>
<b>Post Inspection Agency:</b>  None	<b>Post Inspection Contacts:</b>
<b>Inspector(s):</b>  Robert D. Zuber, P.E.	<b>Inspector's Signature:</b>  <i>Robert D. Zuber</i>  <b>Signature Date:</b>  11/14/2017

**Inspection Topic Summary**

NOTE: Y=Inspected N=Not Inspected R=Comments Noted V=Violation Issued NA=Not Applicable

NA - Air Resource Protection

N - Availability of Records

NA - Backfill &amp; Grading

R - Excess Spoil and Dev. Waste

NA - Explosives

N - Fish &amp; Wildlife

R - Hydrologic Balance

Y - Gen. Compliance With Mine Plan

N - Other

NA - Processing Waste

Y - Roads

Y - Reclamation Success

Y - Revegetation

NA - Subsidence

Y - Slides and Other Damage

NA - Support Facilities On-site

Y - Signs and Markers

Y - Support Facilities Not On-site

N - Special Categories Of Mining

N - Topsoil

**COMMENTS**

A partial inspection was conducted by Rob Zuber of DRMS on November 9, 2017. The weather was clear, and the ground was somewhat muddy. Nick Mason of NECC was present for the inspection.

**EXCESS SPOIL and DEVELOPMENT WASTE – Rule 4.09**

Placement; Drainage Control; Surface Stabilization:

Fills 7, 8, and 9 were inspected. All were generally in good condition with good vegetation cover. At the low end of the east channel of Fill 9, the bare bank looks stable, and rock has been configured by NECC staff to route the ditch flow away from this bank. This spot should be watched closely for erosion problems in the future.

**HYDROLOGIC BALANCE - Rule 4.05**

Drainage Control 4.05.1, 4.05.2, 4.05.3; Siltation Structures 4.05.5, 4.05.6; Discharge Structures 4.05.7, 4.05.10; Diversions 4.05.4; Effluent Limits 4.05.2; Ground Water Monitoring 4.05.13; Surface Water Monitoring 4.05.13; Drainage – Acid and Toxic Materials 4.05.8; Impoundments 4.05.6, 4.05.9; Stream Buffer Zones 4.05.18:

Three ponds were inspected: 8, 9, and 9A. All three were holding water but not discharging. At Pond 8, the water appeared to be below all of the holes on the riser (primary spillway); four rows were visible.

The water in Pond 9 appeared to be 10 inches below the lowest hole. The top of the riser pipe is approximately six feet above the lowest hole on the pipe (which matches the design). There are many rows of holes (at least five), and they are not cut at the same elevations. That is, there are not two holes per row as in the design in the PAP. The rill repair on the downstream side of the Pond 9 dam was stable.

At Pond 9A, the top of the riser pipe is approximately three feet above the lowest hole on the pipe (which matches the design). Only two rows were seen on the riser, but the design indicates that there should be three rows.

In general, the ponds appear to match the PAP design. Although there are some minor discrepancies with the

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 5Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1

configuration of holes on the riser pipes, this should not significantly impact the function of the ponds.

The ditch below Fill 8 appears to be stable, and NECC staff indicated (after the inspection via email) that Vince Massarotti has performed additional rock work with an excavator to keep this steep ditch stable.

Recent work has been performed by Vince Massarotti on Ditch D86 to route it to Culvert 9. This ditch had been routed to Culvert 10, and this was causing erosion on the steep hillside. The re-constructed ditch is three to four feet deep and approximately 15 feet wide. This is in compliance with the design requirement in the Pond 8 SEDCAD model (Exhibit 15 of the PAP): depth of 1.75 feet and width of 10.47 feet. The requirement is for a vegetated channel. Vince Massarotti seeded and mulched the re-constructed channel. The sump above Culvert 9 looked to be functioning well, and no immediate maintenance was needed.

### **DOCUMENTS RECEIVED**

Map 2.05.3-7 for RN-04 revisions.

### **ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS/COMPLIANCE**

No enforcement actions were initiated as a result of this inspection, nor are any pending.

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 5  
Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1

**PHOTOGRAPHS**



**Fill 8**



**Area vulnerable to erosion in Ditch D84**

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 5

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1



**Pond 8**



**Re-constructed Ditch D86**

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 5

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1



**Fill 7**



**East ditch at Fill 9  
(spot to watch closely in circle)**

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 5

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1