

COLORADO Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety Department of Natural Resources

MINERALS PROGRAM INSPECTION REPORT PHONE: (303) 866-3567

The Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety has conducted an inspection of the mining operation noted below. This report documents observations concerning compliance with the terms of the permit and applicable rules and regulations of the Mined Land Reclamation Board.

MINE NAME:	MINE/PROSPECTING ID#:	MINERAL:	COUNTY:
State Pit	M-1990-112	Gravel	Pueblo
INSPECTION TYPE:	INSPECTOR(S):	INSP. DATE:	INSP. TIME:
Monitoring	Elliott R. Russell	February 28, 2018	09:00
OPERATOR:	OPERATOR REPRESENTATIVE:	TYPE OF OPERAT	TION:
Fremont Paving & Redi-Mix, Inc.	Jodi Schrieber	112c - Construction I	Regular Operation

REASON FOR INSPECTION:	ļ	BOND CALCULATION TYPE:	BOND AMOUNT:
Citizen Complaint		Complete Bond	\$103,925.00
DATE OF COMPLAINT:		POST INSP. CONTACTS:	JOINT INSP. AGENCY:
NA		None	None
WEATHER:	INSPE	CTOR'S SIGNATURE:	SIGNATURE DATE:
Clear	At Pull		April 6, 2018

The following inspection topics were identified as having Problems or Possible Violations. OPERATORS SHOULD READ THE FOLLOWING PAGES CAREFULLY IN ORDER TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE PERMIT AND APPLICABLE RULES AND REGULATIONS. If a Possible Violation is indicated, you will be notified under separate cover as to when the Mined Land Reclamation Board will consider possible enforcement action.

GENERAL INSPECTION TOPICS

The following list identifies the environmental and permit parameters inspected

(AR) RECORDS <u>Y</u>	(FN) FINANCIAL WARRANTY Y	(RD) ROADS <u>Y</u>
(HB) HYDROLOGIC BALANCE <u>Y</u>	(BG) BACKFILL & GRADING Y	(EX) EXPLOSIVES <u>NA</u>
(PW) PROCESSING WASTE/TAILING <u>N</u>	(SF) PROCESSING FACILITIES Y	(TS) TOPSOIL <u>Y</u>
(MP) GENL MINE PLAN COMPLIANCE- <u>PB</u>	(FW) FISH & WILDLIFE <u>Y</u>	(RV) REVEGETATION PB
(SM) SIGNS AND MARKERS <u>Y</u>	(SP) STORM WATER MGT PLAN <u>N</u>	(RS) RECL PLAN/COMP <u>Y</u>
(ES) OVERBURDEN/DEV. WASTE <u>N</u>	(SC) SEDIMENT CONTROL PB	(ST) STIPULATIONS <u>N</u>
(AT) ACID OR TOXIC MATERIALS <u>N</u>	(OD) OFF-SITE DAMAGE <u>N</u>	

Y = Inspected / N = Not inspected / NA = Not applicable to this operation / PB = Problem cited / PV = Possible violation cited

PROBLEMS/POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS

INSPECTION TOPIC: Sediment Control

COMPLIANCE PROBLEM #1: The Operator needs to update the permit regarding current storm water controls. The Operator must provide sufficient information to describe or identify how the operator intends to stabilize and protect all surface areas of the affected lands to effectively control erosion and prevent sedimentation. Additional details regarding this compliance problem are provided in this inspection report. **CORRECTIVE ACTIONS:** The operator shall submit a Technical Revision, with the required \$216 revision fee, to update and clarify the current plan to control erosion and sedimentation.

CORRECTIVE ACTION DUE DATE: June 5, 2018

INSPECTION TOPIC: General Compliance with Mine Plan

COMPLIANCE PROBLEM #2: The current mine plan needs to be updated and clarified pursuant to C.R.S. 34-32.5-112(1)(c)(VI). The operator must provide sufficient information to describe or identify how the operator intends to conduct the operation. Additional details regarding this compliance problem are provided in this inspection report.

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS: The operator shall submit a Technical Revision, with the required \$216 revision fee, to update and clarify the current approved mine plan to reflect existing and proposed activities by the corrective action date.

CORRECTIVE ACTION DUE DATE: June 5, 2018

INSPECTION TOPIC: Revegetation

COMPLIANCE PROBLEM #3: Tamarisk (salt cedar) trees are present within or have volunteered into the permit area and are becoming established. This is a problem for failure to employ weed control methods for a state listed noxious weed species within the permitted area, and to reduce the spread of weeds to nearby areas as required by Rule 3.1.10(6). Additional details regarding this compliance problem are provided in this inspection report.

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS: The operator shall develop a weed control and management plan in accordance with Rule 3.1.10(6). This plan should be developed in consultation with the county extension agency, or weed control district office and should include specific control measures to be applied, a schedule for when control measures will be applied and a post-treatment monitoring plan. This weed control plan shall be submitted to the Division as a Technical Revision to the permit with the appropriate Technical Revision fee of \$216.00 by the corrective action date.

CORRECTIVE ACTION DUE DATE: June 5, 2018

OBSERVATIONS

The State Pit was inspected by Elliott Russell with the Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety (Division) in response to a citizen complaint (CT-01) received via email on February 14, 2018 from Ms. Wendi Kern. The complaint was forwarded to Fremont Paving & Redi-Mix, Inc. (Operator) on February 15, 2018. Ms. Kern also submitted multiple emails on February 16th and 28th which were added to the original compliant and also forwarded to the Operator. The complaint identified several of Ms. Kern's concerns at the State Pit, Permit No. M-1990-112. These included (A) overnight stays on State land, (B) mining outside of the boundary, (C) slopes near a gas utility line, (D) use of topsoil to build berms, and (E) storm water controls.

The Division met Ms. Jodi Schrieber, Mr. Josh Ary, and Mr. Mike Ausmus (all representing the Operator) at the entrance to the site along 36th Lane. The State Pit is a Construction Materials 112c Operation and is permitted at

1,046 acres with 755 acres identified as affected land. The State Pit is located on land owned and controlled by the State of Colorado and is managed by the Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners (State Land Board). The site is located approximately 2.8 miles south of Vineland in Pueblo County. Affected lands will be reclaimed to support a post-mining land use of rangeland.

The Division investigated all of Ms. Kern's concerns during the inspection and has summarized the observations below:

- A. <u>Overnight stays on State land</u>: This issue is not within the purview of the Division's jurisdiction. The Division forwarded the compliant to the State Land Board on February 15, 2018. On February 27, 2018, the Division received correspondence from the State Land Board confirming they had received a similar complaint and visited the site in early February. The State Land Board stated nothing was found in violation of lease at the time of the visit.
- B. <u>Mining outside of the boundary</u>: Ms. Kern indicated the northeast portion of the disturbance could be outside of the boundary. The northern portion of the permit was mined by previous Operators until roughly 2004. This area is in final reclamation and the Operator has stated no further mining will re-disturb this area as the operation is now advancing to the south. The Division inspected the northeast area of the permit and observed no evidence of disturbance beyond the affected lands boundary (Photos 1 & 2). Additionally, the Division acquired GPS data of the affected area boundary and compared that to a Google Earth aerial image to confirm all mining disturbances have remained within the affected area boundary.
- C. <u>Slopes near a gas utility line:</u> The northern portion of the permit is bisected by a gas utility line. The 1990 permit application includes information regarding the established slopes leading away for the gas line. The gas utility structure owner asked the Operator to stay 50 feet away from the gas line and have a maximum gradient of 1.5H:1V. The Operator felt this was too steep to revegetate and committed to replacing the excavations near the pipeline with a slope not steeper than 3H:1V on the south facing side and not steeper than 2.5H:1V on the north facing slope. A 2013 structure agreement, executed between the Operator and gas utility structure owner, states that no mining is to occur within 50 feet of the gas line and a minimum of 4H:1V slope will be maintained as a back-slope to the existing right of way (ROW) easement "from this time forward of the current operations." The Division observed the side slopes away from the gas utility line ROW during the inspection (**Photos 3 6**). Based on the revegetation and time since the mining operation was near the gas line (before 2004), these slopes have not been re-disturbed since the 2013 agreement. These slopes appear stable and well vegetated and appropriately graded. The Division recommends the Operator contact the utility company to verify and document there are no issues with the slopes prior to submitting any future release requests of these areas.
- D. <u>Use of topsoil to build berms</u>: The Operator has mined, backfilled, and started to reclaim portions of the affected lands along the western and southern sides of the active mining area (Photos 7 & 8). The Division believes these backfilled areas are the referenced berms in the complaint. The Operator stated these areas were backfilled with overburden, topsoiled, seeded, and mulched in accordance with the approved Reclamation Plan. These areas help contain storm water on the active mining and processing areas from leaving the site. It appears these also serve as a slight visual barrier of the processing area from 36th Lane. The outward slopes of this backfilled area have been seeded and mulched, but have yet to be established with vegetation.
- E. <u>Storm water controls:</u> The approved permit references storm water would be controlled by utilizing low berms between the edge of the disturbance and undisturbed lands, however, also states the land is relatively flat and a NPDES permit is not applicable to the operation as no discharge will occur. Additionally, the

permit states contour furrows and rough grading would control erosion during reclamation. The compliant and subsequent emails from Ms. Kern describe and show storm water leaving the site near the southwest portion of the active disturbance. The outward slopes of the backfilled areas (referenced in Issue D above) directly report to undisturbed lands and a small drainage, within the permit boundary, which travels to the west under 36th Lane via a culvert (**Photos 9 & 10**). The Operator had recently installed new erosion control wattles on various portions of this outward slope as well as across the drainage. There was also an older wattle across the drainage near the permit boundary. The Operator stated a discharge permit from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) has been obtained for the operation. The Division has determined the original permit's storm water and erosion control discussion and the methods being implemented on-site do not appear adequate. The Division recommends establishing more appropriate storm water controls on these un-vegetated outward facing slopes as they currently exhibit the potential for erosion and sedimentation. Such controls could include contour ditches and berms, silt fencing, more wattles, or other Best Management Practices (BMPs). This issue has been cited as Compliance Problem #1 on page two of this report. The Operator is required to submit a Technical Revision to the permit to address improved erosion control BMPs and an updated Exhibit M regarding the discharge permit in accordance with C.R.S. 34-32.5-116(4)(j) and Rules 3.1.5(3), 6.4.7(2)(c), and 6.4.13.

After the investigation of list of concerns in Ms. Kern's compliant, the Division proceeded with a normal monitoring inspection. Those observations are discussed below.

<u>Availability of Records:</u> The Operator has complied with the most recent Annual Report, Map and Fee, due on June 15, 2017. The last inspection at the State Pit was conducted January 18, 2012. There are no open infractions. The Division approved a Succession of Operators (SO-03) from Larfarge West, Inc. to the Operator on December 9, 2013.

<u>General Compliance with Mine Plan:</u> The operation extracts gravel from eroded river terraces and processes the material with a mobile crushing and screening plant (**Photos 11 & 12**). The Operator states the operation is currently removing approximately 3-12 feet of overburden and mining approximately 15 feet of gravel. The active mining highwall is currently located along the east portion of the pit (**Photo 13**). Various product stockpiles are located around and to the west of the processing plant (**Photo 14**).

The original permit discusses major (20 acres), moderate (50 acres), and minor (100 acres) level of disturbances at any given time during the operation and accordingly address in the original bond calculation. The Division no longer uses the major/moderate/minor disturbance categories and it is no longer defined in the Act or Rules. In accordance with Rule 4.2.1(1) and 6.4.12(1), the Division now calculates the required financial warranties based on the actual current cost of fulfilling the requirements of the Reclamation Plan. The Division estimates there are now currently 100 acres disturbed associated with activing mining and processing areas and approximately 122 acres in various stages of reclamation. These issues have been cited as Compliance Problem #2 on page two of this report. The Operator is required to submit a Technical Revision to the Mining Plan to address how the Operator intends on conducting the mining operation.

Signs and Markers: The mine identification sign was posted at the entrance of the mine site along the east side of 36th Lane (**Photo 15**). The Affected lands boundary was recently survey by the Operator and was delineated with tall PVC pipes painted with florescent green (**Photo 16**). The GPS location of these markers were recorded with a Trimble Juno 3b unit. The attached *DRMS 2-28-18 Inspection Map M1990112* delineates the GPS location of these boundary markers. The Operator stated that the original hand-drawn Mine Plan and Reclamation Plan Maps contain various errors and inaccuracies based on the total affected and permit acreages. The Division suggests the Operator submit updated Mine and Reclamation Plan Maps, in accordance with Rules 6.4.3 and 6.4.6, as a Technical Revision to the permit.

<u>Financial Warranty:</u> The Division currently holds a Financial Warranty in the amount of \$103,925.00 in the form of a corporate surety. The last time the Division evaluated the financial warranty was in 2012. The Division has re-evaluated the Financial Warranty held for the site based on the current level of disturbance and the approved mining and reclamation plan. The Division calculated the liability at the site to be \$404,500.00. This is \$300,575 more than the currently held financial warranty. The Division's estimate is enclosed with this report for the Operator's review. The Division requests that the Operator review the cost estimate and provide the Division with any questions or concerns by **April 20, 2018**. The Division may issue a surety increase revision after April 20, 2018 and require the Operator to post the additional required financial warranty in accordance with Rule 4.2.1(2). The Operator will have 60 days from the date of the separate notice of surety increase to provide the additional financial warranty.

<u>Topsoil</u>: Topsoil has been salvaged and stockpiled in several stockpiles around the site. The Division estimates there is sufficient salvaged topsoil on site to be replaced on the existing disturbance for reclamation.

Revegetation: As discussed above, the northern portion of the site, approximately 122 acres has been mined and is in final reclamation. The southern half of this area (approximately 56 acres) has yet establish appropriate vegetative cover and may need to be re-seeded. The northern half of this area (approximately 66 acres) has vegetation established. This 66-acre area is located from the northern edge of the mining disturbance to the toe of the southern gas utility line slope as well as a section on the south side of the utility line in the northeast portion of the mining distubnace. This area could be eligible for release through an Acreage Reduction request, however, Tamarisk is starting to establish on the reclaimed lands (Photos 3, 6, & 17). Tamarisk is a noxious weed List B species which will need to be controlled. The current permit does not contain a weed control and management plan in accordance with Rule 3.1.10(6). This issue has been cited as Compliance Problem #3 on page two of this report. The Operator is required to submit a Technical Revision to the permit to address the control and management of Tamarisk. The Weed Control Plan shall provide the control methods, a schedule for when control measures will be applied, and a post-treatment monitoring plan. The Division recommends you contact the Pueblo County Weed Manager for assistance with this plan. The 12th edition of the Noxious Weeds of Colorado handbook by the Colorado Weed Management Association lists Bill Alt at 719-586-9768 and balt7302@gmail.com as the Pueblo County Weed Manager. Please note, a Technical Revision to the Weed Control Plan will be required if the Operator intends to modify this plan in the future to include new treatment methods and time tables for other noxious weed species. The Division recommends the Operator develop specific management plans for several common noxious weed species that occur in the area of the State Pit and submit those with the required Weed Control Plan, as this will avoid having to submit future Technical Revision(s) for any new species. The Pueblo County Weed Manager should be able to assist you in determining which noxious weed species are likely to occur within the area of the State Pit and provide you with the management plans for those species.

This concludes the Division's Inspection Report; a subset of photographs taken during the time of the inspection are included below. If you need additional information or have any questions, please contact me at Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety, 1313 Sherman Street, Room 215, Denver, CO 80203, by telephone at **303-866-3567 x8132**, or by email at <u>elliott.russell@state.co.us</u>.

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 1. Reclaimed disturbance in northeast portion of the site near the affected lands boundary (approximately delineated by red-dashed line); looking northeast.



Photo 2. Reclaimed disturbance in northeast portion of the site near the affected lands boundary (approximately delineated by red-dashed line); looking southwest.



Photo 3. Portion of the southern slope along gas utility line, tamarisk circled in red; looking west.



Photo 4. Portion of the northern slope along gas utility line; looking west.



Photo 5. Portion of the southern slope along gas utility line; looking west.



Photo 6. Portion of the northern slope along gas utility line, tamarisk circled in red; looking east.



Photo 7. Backfilled and seeded area (circled in dotted yellow) along western portion of the site; looking northeast.



Photo 8. Backfilled and seeded area along western portion of the site; looking south from on top of the backfilled and seeded area.



Photo 9. Backfilled and seeded area in need of improved erosion control BMPs; looking east.



Photo 10. Drainage located to the south of the backfilled and seeded areas, 36th Lane culvert headwall in foreground; looking east.



Photo 11. Active operation overview; looking northwest from the southern portion of the permit.



Photo 12. Active mining face along east side of the pit; looking southeast.



Photo 13. Inward facing slope of the backfilled area south of the active mining and processing areas; looking northeast.



Photo 14. Various product stockpiles located west of the active pit and processing area; looking east.



Photo 15. Permit identification sign posted at the entrance to the site along 36th Lane; looking south.



Photo 16. Sample photo of the affected area boundary markers; looking west.



Photo 17. Tamarisk infestation (circled in red) in northern portion of the site; looking northwest.

Inspection Contact Address

Jodi Schrieber Fremont Paving & Redi-Mix, Inc. 839 MacKenzie Avenue Canon City, CO 81212

Attachment: DRMS 2-28-18 Inspection Map M1990112

- Enclosure: Reclamation Cost Estimate M1990112
- CC: Wally Erickson with Division of Reclamation, Mining, and Safety Phillip Courtney with State Land Board Al Stafford with CDPHE Water Quality Control Division Wendi Kern

DRMS 2-28-18 Inspection Map M1990112

Aerial Image Date: 8/28/13 Prepared by ERR on 4/6/18

331

Google Earth

© 2018 Google

Legend

Olson-Rd

38

4000 ft

Approximate Active Disturbance
Approximate Permit Boundary
Delinated Affected Area Boundary
Possible Reseeding Area
State Pit (M-1990-112) Entrance
Weed Treatment Required Prior to Release

State Aller

COST SUMMARY WORK

]	Fask descrip	otion:	Cost Summary of	of Reclamati	on Tasks			
Site:	State Pit		Pe	rmit Action:	2018 Update	Permit/Job	o#: M1990112	
<u>P</u>]	ROJECT Task #:	IDENTIFIC	CATION State:	Colorado		Abbreviation:	None	
	Date: User:	4/5/2018 ERR	County:	Pueblo		Filename:	M112-000	_
	Age	ency or organi	zation name: DF	RMS				

TASK LIST (DIRECT COSTS)

Task		Form	Fleet	Task	
Task	Description	Used	Size	Hours	Cost
001	Grade Highwall and Misc. Slopes	DOZER	2	15.42	\$6,329.00
002	Replace Subsoil and Topsoil	SCRAPER1	1	31.97	\$113,623.00
003	Revegetate the Active Mining Area	REVEGE	1	50.00	\$131,610.00
004	Reseed the 56-acre Area	REVEGE	1	28.00	\$73,701.00
005	Mob/Demob Reclamation Equipment	MOBILIZE	1	1.96	\$11,378.00
		<u>SUBTO</u>	<u>TALS:</u>	127.35	\$336,641

INDIRECT COSTS

OVERHEAD AND PROFIT:

Liability insurance:	2.02	Total =	\$6,800.15
Performance bond:	1.05	Total =	\$3,534.73
Job superintendent:	63.67	Total =	\$4,651.09
Profit:	10.00	Total =	\$33,664.10
		TOTAL O & $P =$	\$48,650.07
		CONTRACT AMOUNT (direct + O & P) = $($	\$385,291.07

LEGAL - ENGINEERING - PROJECT MANAGEMENT:

Financial warranty processing (legal/related costs):	0.00	Total =	0.00
Engineering work and/or contract/bid preparation:	0.00	Total =	\$0.00
Reclamation management and/or administration:	5.00		\$19,264.55
CONTINGENCY:	0.00	Total =	\$0.00
		TOTAL INDIRECT COST =	\$67,914.62
TOTAL BO	ND AN	IOUNT (direct + indirect) =	\$404,555.62

BULLDOZER WORK

	P	ermit Action:	2018 Update	Permit/Jo	b#: <u>M199011</u>
ROJECT IDENTIFI	CATION				
Task #: 001	State:	Colorado		Abbreviation:	None
Date: 4/5/2018	County:	Pueblo		Filename:	M112-001
User: ERR	·				
A gap ou or organ	vization name: D	PMS			
Agency of organ					
OURLY EQUIPME	NT COST				
Basic Machine: Cat	t D8T - 8SU				
Horsepower: 310)				
Blade Type: Ser	mi-Universal				
Attachment: 3-s	hank ripper				
Shift Basis: <u>1 p</u>	er day				
Data Source: (CI	RG)				
ost Breakdown:		1			
~ ~ ~		*••••	Utilization %		
Ownership Cost/Hour:		\$83.81	NA		
Operating Cost/Hour: Ripper own		<u></u> \$00.1/	100		
Cost/Hour:		\$7.55	NA		
Ripper op. Cost/Hour:		\$7.21	100		
		A 40 50			
Operator Cost/Hour:		\$40.52	NA		
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour:	\$205.26	\$40.52	NA		
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour:	\$205.26 \$410.52	\$40.52	NA		
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: [ATERIAL QUANT]	\$205.26 \$410.52	\$40.52	NA		
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: [ATERIAL QUANT] Initial Volume: <u>15,6</u>	\$205.26 \$410.52 TTIES	\$40.52	NA		
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANT Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 125	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 21 L CX	\$40.52	NA		
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANTI Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY	\$40.52	NA		
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANTI Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS	\$40.52		all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANT Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (11 Cat Han	\$40.52	 5' H x 1800' L highw	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: IATERIAL QUANTI Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 125 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swelfactor:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (Cat Han	\$40.52	 5' H x 1800' L highw	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANTI Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swelfactor: factor:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (11 Cat Han	 Observations: 2.	 5' H x 1800' L highw 	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANTI Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swelfactor: OURLY PRODUCT	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS Il Cat Han TION	\$40.52	 5' H x 1800' L highw 	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANT Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 12,5 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (11 Cat Han ION 75 feet	\$40.52	 5' H x 1800' L highw 	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANTI Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 19,5 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (Cat Han TION 75 feet 1,017.1 L0	S40.52 Observations: 2 adbook	<u>NA</u> 	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swell factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (11 Cat Han TON 75 feet 1,017.1 L0	\$40.52	 5' H x 1800' L highw 	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swell factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (11 Cat Han DRMS (10 Cat Han TON TON Solution Solution Comp Comp	\$40.52 Observations: 2 idbook CY/hr pacted fill or em	 5' H x 1800' L highw bankment 0.9	all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANT Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 19,5 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (Cat Han TON 75 feet 1,017.1 L0 escription: Comp -30 %	\$40.52		all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de Average push gradient:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 325 30 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (Cat Ham II Cat Ham TON 75 feet 1,017.1 L0 esscription: Comp -30 %	\$40.52 Observations: 2 adbook CY/hr pacted fill or em		all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de Average push gradient: Average site altitude:	<u>\$205.26</u> \$410.52 ITIES 325 31 LCY Ime: DRMS 0 11 Cat Han TON <u>75 feet</u> 1,017.1 L0 escription: Comp -30 % <u>4,800 feet</u>	 Observations: 2. idbook CY/hr pacted fill or em		all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 1.25 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swelfactor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de Average push gradient: Average site altitude: Material weight:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS 0 11 Cat Han TON 75 feet 1,017.1 L0 escription: Comp -30 % 4,800 feet 2 650 lbs/LCY	 Observations: 2 adbook		all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 125 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de Average push gradient: Average site altitude: Material weight:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 31 LCY Ime: DRMS (11 Cat Han Cat Han TON TON TON Cat Han Cat Han Comp Cat Han Comp Cat Han Comp Cat Han Cat 	 Observations: 2 adbook		<u>all</u>	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: ATERIAL QUANTI Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 12,5 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de Average push gradient: Average site altitude: Material weight: Weight description:	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 325 31 LCY Ime: DRMS 0 11 Cat Han TON TON TON 25 50 31 LCY 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	 Observations: 2 adbook CY/hr pacted fill or em		all	
Operator Cost/Hour: Total unit Cost/Hour: Total Fleet Cost/Hour: Initial Volume: 15,6 Swell factor: 125 Loose volume: 19,5 Source of estimated volu Source of estimated swe factor: OURLY PRODUCT Average push distance: Unadjusted hourly production: Materials consistency de Average push gradient: Average site altitude: Material weight: Weight description: b Condition Correction	\$205.26 \$410.52 ITIES 525 50 (31 LCY Ime: DRMS (11 Cat Han TON 75 feet 1,017.1 L0 escription: Comp -30 % 4,800 feet 2,650 lbs/LCY Decomposed roc Factor	 Observations: 2 adbook CY/hr pacted fill or em		<u>all</u>	

Material consistency:	0.900	(CAT HB))
Dozing method:	1.000	(GEN.)
Visibility:	1.000	(AVG.)
Job efficiency:	0.830	(1 SHIFT/DAY)
Spoil pile:	0.800	(FND-RF)
Push gradient:	1.601	(CAT HB)
Altitude:	1.000	(CAT HB)
Material Weight:	0.868	(CAT HB)
Blade type:	1.000	(PAT)

Net correction: 0.6228

Adjusted unit	633 15 I CV/hr
production:	055.45 LC 1/11
Adjusted fleet	1266 Q I CV/br
production:	1200.7 LC 1/10

JOB TIME AND COST

Fleet size:	2 Dozer(s)
Unit cost:	\$0.324/LCY

Total job time:	15.42 Hours
Total job cost:	\$6,329

Page 1 of 2

SCRAPER TEAM WORK

Site: State Pit		Perm	it Action	: 2018 Update	I	Permit/Job#: <u>M1</u>	990112
PROJECT IDEN	TIFICATION						
Trach #1 002		Ctata.	C alanada		4 h h		
Date: $\frac{4/5}{2}$	$\overline{)18}$	state:	Colorado Pueblo		Addre	lename: M112	.002
User: ERR		unty	ucolo				002
Agency or	organization name	: DRM	IS				
HOURLY EQUIP	MENT			COSTS	Shift basis: <u>1 per</u>	day	
			Equipme	ent Description			
	-5	Scraper:	Cat 65	7G			
Suppo	rt Fauinment -Loa	-Dozer:	NA Cat D8	T - 8SU			
Suppo	-Dum	p Area:	Cat D8	T - 8SU			
Road Ma	intenance – Motor	Grader:	CAT 1	2M			
	-Water	Truck:	Water	Tanker, 2,500 Ga	ıl.		
<u>Cost Break</u> down:	Scraper Wo	rk Team		Support Equ	ipment	Maintenanc	e Equipmen [,]
	Scraper	Doz	zer	Load Area	Dump Area	Motor Grader	Water Tru
%Utilization-machine:	100		NA	100	100	100	
Ownership cost/hour:	\$154.79		NA	\$83.81	\$83.81	\$28.02	\$7
Operating cost/hour:	\$184.57		NA	\$66.17	\$66.17	\$28.28	\$7
%Utilization-ripper:	NA		NA	0	0	NA]
Ripper own. cost/hour:	NA		NA	\$7.55	\$7.55	\$0.00	\$0
Ripper op. cost/hour:	NA		NA	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0
Operator cost/hour:	\$41.67		NA	\$40.52	\$40.52	\$38.16	\$0
Unit Subtotals:	\$381.03		NA	\$198.05	\$198.05	\$94.46	\$15
Number of Units:	8		0	1	1	1	
Group Subtotals:	Work:	\$3,04	8.24	Support:	\$396.10	Maint:	\$109.71
Total work team cost	/hour: \$3,554.05						
MATERIAL QUA	NTITIES						
Initial volume:	161,333		CCY	Swell fac	tor: 1.000		
Loose volume:	161,333		LCY				
Sou	rce of estimated vo	olume:	Applica	tion: 6" subsoil	-6"topsoil. 100 a	cres	
Source	of estimated swell	factor:	Cat Han	dbook	•		
	UCTION						
HOURLY PROD	UCTION			Scraper F	Rowl (volume) B	acic.	
Matanial 1	2 650 1L - / CV			<u>Seruper L</u>	Volumer 22.00)	CV
Material description:	2,030 IDS/LCY	ck - 25%	Rock	Struck Heaned	Volume: 32.00	<u>) </u>	CY CY
material description.	75% Earth	en 2370		Treaped	, stunie. ++.00	, <u>г</u>	
	104.000 mounds			Average	Volume: 38.00) I	CV
Rated Payload:	104,000 pounds			Average	volume. <u>50.00</u>		

1.00 Minutes

0.60 Minutes

Cycle Time:

Scraper Loading Time: Maneuver and Spread Time:

Job Condition Correction:

Site Altitude: 4800 feet

	Scraper	Push Dozer	Source
Altitude Adj:	1.000	NA	(CAT HB)
Job Efficiency:	0.830	NA	(CAT HB)
Net Correction:	0.830	NA	

Travel Time:

Road Condition: Hard, smooth, stabilized, surfaced, watered, maintained 2.0

Haul Route:

Seg #	Haul Distance (Ft)	Grade (%)	Roll. Res (%)	Total Res (%)	Velocity (fpm)	Travel Time (min)
1	1500.00	-1.00	2.00	1.00	3004	0.73

Haul Time: 0.73 minutes

Return Route:

Seg #	Haul Distance (Ft)	Grade (%)	Roll. Res (%)	Total Res (%)	Velocity (fpm)	Travel Time (min)
1	1500.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2958	0.67

Return Time:	0.67	minutes
Total Scraper team cycle time:	3.00	minutes
Adjusted for job conditions:	630.80	LCY/Hour
Selected Number of Scrapers:	8	Scraper(s)
Adjusted single scraper team (unit) hourly production:	5,046.40	LCY/Hour
Adjusted multiple scraper team (fleet) hourly production:	5,046.40	LCY/Hour
Une directed unit and duction /hours 760.00 LCV/User		

Unadjusted unit production/hour: 760.00 LCY/Hour Optimal Number of Scrapers per push dozer:

JOB TIME AND COST

Fleet size:	1	Team(s)	Total job time:	31.97	Hours
Unit cost:	\$0.704	/LCY	Total job cost:	\$113,623	

REVEGETATION WORK

Ta	sk descrip	tion:	Revegetate the A	ctive Minin	g Area		
Site: _	State Pit		Pe	rmit Action:	2018 Update	Permit/Job	o#: <u>M1990112</u>
<u>PR</u>	OJECT :	IDENTIFIC	CATION				
	Task #:	003	State:	Colorado		Abbreviation:	None
	Date:	4/5/2018	County:	Pueblo		Filename:	M112-003
	User:	ERR		-		-	

FERTILIZING

Materials

	Units /			G
Description	Acre	Unit	Cost / Unit	Cost /Acre
Ammonium nitrate, 33-0-0	121.20	pound	\$0.34	\$41.21
Triple superphosphate, 0-46-0	87.00	pound	\$0.43	\$37.41
			Total Fertilizer	
			Materials	
			Cost/Acre	\$78.62

Application

Description	Cost /Acre
Truck whirlwind spreader (MEANS 32 01 90.13 0140)	\$111.08
Total Fertilizer Application Cost/Acre	\$111.08

TILLING

Description	Cost /Acre
Chisel plowing {DMG}	\$90.60
Weed control spraying (MEANS 31 31 16.13 3100)	\$242.00
Total Tilling Cost/Acre	\$332.60

SEEDING

Seed Mix	Rate – PLS LBS / Acre	Seeds per SQ. FT	Cost /Acre
Blue Grama - Hachita	0.40	6.53	\$6.51
Crested Wheatgrass - Hy-Crest	2.00	9.18	\$8.84
Sideoats Grama - El Reno	1.50	4.92	\$14.51
Intermediate Wheatgrass - Oahe	2.50	5.34	\$9.60
Pubescent Wheatgrass - Luna	2.50	5.17	\$10.18
White Sweet Clover	0.25	1.49	\$1.03
Western Wheatgrass - Arriba	3.00	7.58	\$24.24
Totals Seed Mix	12.15	40.21	\$74.90

Application

Description		Cost /Acre
Drill Seeding (DRMS Survey Cost)		\$232.00
	Total Seed Application Cost/Acre	\$232.00

MULCHING and MISCELLANEOUS

Materials

Description	Units / Acre	Unit	Cost / Unit	Cost /Acre
Straw, delivered {MEANS 31 25 14.16 1200}	1.00	TON	\$261.00	\$261.00
Total Mulch Materials Cost/Acre				\$261.00

Application

Description		Cost /Acre
Crimping, with tractor {DMG survey data}		\$66.02
	Total Mulch Application Cost/Acre	\$66.02
	Total Mulch Application Cost/Acre	\$66.02

NURSERY STOCK PLANTING

Common Name	No / Acre	Type and Size	Planting Cost	Fertilizer Pellet Cost	Cost /Acre
					\$
		Totals	Nursery Stoc	ek Cost / Acre	\$0.00

JOB TIME AND COST

Estimate	No. of Acres: ed Failure Rate:	100 25%		Cost /Acre: Cost /Acre*:	\$1,156.22 \$639.50
*Selected Replanti	ng Work Items:	TILLING,SEED	DING		
Initial Job Cost:	\$115,622.00				
Reseeding Job Cost:	\$15,987.50				
Total Job Cost:	\$131,610				
Job Hours:	50.00				

REVEGETATION WORK

1990112
-004

FERTILIZING

Materials

	Units /			
Description	Acre	Unit	Cost / Unit	Cost /Acre
Ammonium nitrate, 33-0-0	121.20	pound	\$0.34	\$41.21
Triple superphosphate, 0-46-0	87.00	pound	\$0.43	\$37.41
			Total Fertilizer Materials	
			Cost/Acre	\$78.62

Application

Description	Cost /Acre
Truck whirlwind spreader (MEANS 32 01 90.13 0140)	\$111.08
Total Fertilizer Application Cost/Acre	\$111.08

TILLING

Description	Cost /Acre
Chisel plowing {DMG}	\$90.60
Weed control spraying (MEANS 31 31 16.13 3100)	\$242.00
Total Tilling Cost/Acre	\$332.60

SEEDING

Seed Mix	Rate – PLS LBS / Acre	Seeds per SQ. FT	Cost /Acre
Blue Grama - Hachita	0.40	6.53	\$6.51
Crested Wheatgrass - Hy-Crest	2.00	9.18	\$8.84
Sideoats Grama - El Reno	1.50	4.92	\$14.51
Intermediate Wheatgrass - Oahe	2.50	5.34	\$9.60
Pubescent Wheatgrass - Luna	2.50	5.17	\$10.18
White Sweet Clover	0.25	1.49	\$1.03
Western Wheatgrass - Arriba	3.00	7.58	\$24.24
Totals Seed Mix	12.15	40.21	\$74.90

Application

Description		Cost /Acre
Drill Seeding (DRMS Survey Cost)		\$232.00
	Total Seed Application Cost/Acre	\$232.00

MULCHING and MISCELLANEOUS

Materials

Description	Units / Acre	Unit	Cost / Unit	Cost /Acre
Straw, delivered {MEANS 31 25 14.16 1200}	1.00	TON	\$261.00	\$261.00
Total Mulch Materials Cost/Acre				\$261.00

Application

Description		Cost /Acre
Crimping, with tractor {DMG survey data}		\$66.02
	Total Mulch Application Cost/Acre	\$66.02
	Total Mulch Application Cost/Acre	\$66.02

NURSERY STOCK PLANTING

Common Name	No / Acre	Type and Size	Planting Cost	Fertilizer Pellet Cost	Cost /Acre
					\$
Totals Nursery Stock Cost / Acre				\$0.00	

JOB TIME AND COST

No. of Acres: Estimated Failure Rate:	<u>56</u> 25%	Cost /Acre: Cost /Acre*:	<u>\$1,156.22</u> \$639.50
*Selected Replanting Work Items:	TILLING,SEEDING		<i><i><i>4007.30</i></i></i>
Initial Job Cost: \$64.748.32			

Initial Job Cost:	\$64,748.32
Reseeding Job Cost:	\$8,953.00
Total Job Cost:	\$73,701
Job Hours:	28.00

EQUIPMENT MOBILIZATION/DEMOBILIZATION

Task description	: <u>Mo</u>	b/Demob Reclam	ation Equipme	ent			
: State Pit		Permit	Action: 2018	Update		Permit/Job#:	M1990112
PROJECT IDE	ENTIFICATI	<u>ON</u>					
Task #: 00	5	State: Co	lorado		Abbre	eviation: Nor	ne
Date: 4/2 User: EF	5/2018 RR	County: Pu	eblo		Fr	ilename: M1	12-005
Agency	or organization	n name: DRMS					
EQUIPMENT	TRANSPOR	<u>T RIG COST</u>					
					Shift ba	usis: 1 per	dav
					Cost Data Sou	rce: CRG I	Data
True	ck Trailer Desc	ription: G	ENERIC FOLD	400 HI DING GOO FRAILER	P (2ND HALF, OSENECK, DF R (25T, 50T, AN	Z006) ROP DECK EQ ND 100T)	UIPMENT
Cost Breakdown:							
Available Rig (Capacities	0-25 Tons	26-50 Tons	51	+ Tons		
Ownershi	p Cost/Hour:	\$16.63	\$18.37	\$	522.33		
Operatin	g Cost/Hour:	\$44.38	<u>38 \$46.13 \$50</u>		50.07		
Operato	or Cost/Hour:	\$27.00	\$27.66	\$	27.00		
Tetal Un	er Cost/Hour:	\$0.00	\$23.39	¢	125.39		
I otal Un	it Cost/Hour:	\$88.67	\$117.55	\$	125.45		
NON ROADAI	BLE EQUIPN	MENT:					
Machine	Weight/	Owner ship	Haul Rig	Fleet	Haul Trip	Return Trip	DOT Permit
Description	Unit	Cost/hr/ unit	Cost/hr/uni	Size	Cost/hr/	Cost/hr/ fleet	Cost/ fleet
-	(TONS)		t		fleet		
Cat D8T - 8SU	53.08	\$91.36	\$125.45	2	\$433.62	\$250.90	\$500.00
Cat 657G	78.88	\$154.79	\$125.45	8	\$2,241.92	\$1,003.60	\$2,000.00
CAT 12M	16.01	\$30.01	\$88.67	1	\$118.68	\$88.67	\$250.00
Drill/Broadcast Seeder with Tractor	25.00	\$12.22	\$88.67	1	\$100.89	\$88.67	\$250.00
						1	

Subtotals: **\$2,990.81 \$1,520.51**

ROADABLE EQUIPMENT:

Machine Description	Total Cost/hr/ unit	Fleet Size	Haul Trip Cost/hr/ fleet	Return Trip Cost/hr/ fleet
Water Tanker, 2,500 Gal.	\$22.62	1	\$22.62	\$22.62
		Subtotals:	\$22.62	\$22.62

\$3,250.00

EQUIPMENT HAUL DISTANCE and Time

Nearest Major City or Town within project area region:	PUEBLO	
Total one-way travel distance:	17.00	miles
Average Travel Speed:	50.00	mph
Total Non-Roadable Mob/Demob Cost * '* two round trips with haul rig:	\$11,362.18	
Total Roadable Mob/Demob Cost ** ** one round trip, no haul rig:	\$15.38	

Transportation Cycle Time:

	Non-	
	Roadable	Roadable
	Equipment	Equipment
Haul Time (Hours):	0.34	0.34
Return Time (Hours):	0.34	0.34
Loading Time (Hours):	0.15	NA
Unloading Time (Hours):	0.15	NA
Subtotals:	0.98	0.68

JOB TIME AND COST

Total job time: **1.96** Hours

Total job cost: ______\$11,378