



STATE OF  
COLORADO

West - DNR, Lucas <lucas.west@state.co.us>

---

## C-1981-035 King Coal September 2025 Partial Inspection Report

1 message

---

**West - DNR, Lucas** <lucas.west@state.co.us>

Wed, Sep 24, 2025 at 2:53 PM

To: McCourt Jordan <jmccourt@gcc.com>, Wymore Wade <wwymore@gcc.com>, Michael Dickson <michael@summitmining.co>, Clayton Wein - DNR <clayton.wein@state.co.us>, DNR DRMS\_CoalAdmin - DNR <dnr\_drms\_coal\_admin@state.co.us>

Good Afternoon All,

Attached below is my Inspection Report from our Inspection last week. Things look good and no maintenance items were identified. Please keep us posted as things develop and let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!  
Lucas

Lucas West  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
Minerals Program, Grand Junction Field Office



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

P 303.919.2997 |

Physical: 1313 Sherman Street, Room 215, Denver, CO 80203

Mailing: DRMS Room 215, 1001 E 62nd Ave, Denver, CO 80216

[lucas.west@state.co.us](mailto:lucas.west@state.co.us) | <https://drms.colorado.gov/>



**C-1981-035 King Coal Sept 2025 Partial Inspection Report.pdf**


2325K



**PERMIT INFORMATION**

<b>Permit Number:</b> C-1981-035 <b>Mine Name:</b> King Coal Mine <b>Operator:</b> GCC Energy, LLC <b>Operator Address:</b> Mr Jordan McCourt 6473 County Road 120 Hesperus, CO 81326	<b>County:</b> La Plata <b>Operation Type:</b> Underground <b>Permit Status:</b> Active <b>Ownership:</b> Private
	<b>Operator Representative Present:</b>  Wade Wymore
<b>Operator Representative Signature: (Field Issuance Only)</b>  	

**INSPECTION INFORMATION**

<b>Inspection Start Date:</b> September 16, 2025 <b>Inspection Start Time:</b> 14:05 <b>Inspection End Date:</b> September 16, 2025 <b>Inspection End Time:</b> 16:06	<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>  Lucas West	<b>Inspector's Signature:</b>  <b>Signature Date:</b>  9/24/2025

**Inspection Topic Summary**

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

N - Air Resource Protection

N - Availability of Records

N - Backfill &amp; Grading

R - Excess Spoil and Dev. Waste

N - Explosives

N - Fish &amp; Wildlife

R - Hydrologic Balance

N - Gen. Compliance With Mine Plan

N - Other

N - Processing Waste

N - Roads

N - Reclamation Success

N - Revegetation

N - Subsidence

N - Slides and Other Damage

N - Support Facilities On-site

N - Signs and Markers

N - Support Facilities Not On-site

N - Special Categories Of Mining

N - Topsoil

**COMMENTS**

This was a partial inspection conducted by Lucas West of the Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety's Active Mines Program. Wade Wymore of GCC accompanied the Inspection and represented the Operator. Weather conditions were clear and dry at the time of the Inspection.

The site was not active at the time of the inspection no underground mining or production was being conducted, however a few trucks were being loaded from stockpiles on the surface. Nine Photos accompany this report to illustrate the current site conditions.

No maintenance items or possible violations were noted during this inspection

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

Placement; Drainage Control; Surface Stabilization:

During this inspection, both the Upper and Lower Refuse Piles were observed at the King I facility. The Upper Refuse Pile (URP) was found to be in good condition. The surface of the pile is well compacted and material size appears to be within design specifications. No evidence of settling, slumping or erosion was noted. The stockpile located at the back of the pile, awaiting placement, appeared to be stable at the time of the inspection. The stockpile does not show signs of recent removal and is in similar condition to the Division's previous inspections. The pile demonstrates positive drainage and no impounded stormwater was observed despite recent storms. The out slopes of the pile are also in good condition and no evidence of erosion was noted. The URP can be seen in Photo One. The Lower Refuse Pile (LRP) was also found to be in good condition. The surface of the pile is well compacted and material appears to be within the design specifications. No signs of settling, slumping or erosion was noted on the surface of the refuse pile. The small stockpile of material awaiting placement appeared to be stable and no evidence of erosion of the stockpile was noted. The out slopes of the LRP also appeared stable at the time of the inspection and no erosion was noted. A small pool of collected stormwater was noted in the Northwest corner of the pile, however is not considered a problem at this time. The LRP can be seen in Photo Two.

**HYDROLOGIC BALANCE - Rule 4.05**

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 2

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1

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:

The main focus of this inspection was on the internal drainage structures at the King I, II and the Ute Barn Areas.

At the King I facility all culverts and water conveyances along the access road from the LRP to URP were observed. All ditches were free from obstruction and appeared to be able to function as designed. The culverts were all clear from blockage and no sediment was noted in the culverts. All of the lower water conveyances including reaches 10 and 13 around the LRP were found to be in good condition. The ditches showed no signs of down cutting or erosion and were free from obstruction. Examples of Reach 10 and 13 can be seen in Photos Three and Four. In the lower areas, all sumps and internal drainages leading to the East and West Sediment ponds respectively were also free from obstruction and able to function as designed. Photo Five shows the West Sediment Pond which contained some standing water however the water and sediment levels are well below the witness mark on the cleanout indicator post. The pond showed no signs of discharge and the banks are well vegetated and in good condition. The East Sediment Pond contained no standing water as seen in Photo Six and the sediment levels are well below the cleanout indicator post. The banks and bottom of the pond appeared stable and in good condition during the inspection.

At the Ute Barn area, the main sediment control structure adjacent to the access road was observed. The structure contained standing water from recent precipitation events, however showed no signs of overtopping. The rock check dams appear to be functioning as designed however are becoming silted in. The Operator should consider cleaning them out soon, but at this time it is not considered a maintenance item. The area can be seen in Photo Seven.

At the King II Area, the main sediment pond was observed as seen in Photo Eight. The pond contained standing water, however no evidence of discharge was noted. The sediment levels are well below the cleanout elevations on the indicator post. The banks of the pond are well vegetated and appeared stable at the time of the inspection. Both inlet culverts were observed to be free from obstruction and actively flowing during the inspection. All internal drainage ditches were observed around the processing and shop areas. All of the observed ditches were free from obstruction and appeared to be able to function as designed. Located in the processing area, at various locations are sumps feeding the internal drainage pipes that lead to the sediment pond. All sumps were clear and functioning as designed. An example of the sumps can be seen in Photo Nine. All culverts associated with the internal drainage systems were found to be free flowing and functioning as designed.

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 2

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1

**PHOTOGRAPHS**

Photo One: View East, showing the Upper Refuse Pile at the King I facility. The URP is well compacted, and no evidence of settling, slumping or erosion was noted.



Photo Two: View Northeast, showing the Lower Refuse Pile at the King I facility. The LRP is well compacted and in good condition.

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 2

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1





Photo Three: View North, showing an example of Reach 10, that conveys water around the South side of the LRP.



Photo Four: View Northeast, showing an example of Reach 13, that conveys internal drainage water round the North side of the LRP.

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 2

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1





Photo Five: View West, showing the West Sediment Pond at the King I facility. The pond contained standing water, but no evidence of discharge was noted.



Photo Six: View Northeast, showing the East Sediment Pond at the King I facility. The pond contained no standing water and is in good condition.

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 2

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1





Photo Seven: View Southeast, showing the rock check dam and sediment control structure at the Ute Barn Area.



Photo Eight: View South, showing the main sediment pond at the King II Facility. The pond contains standing water; however, no evidence of discharge was noted.

Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 2

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1





Number of Partial Inspection this Fiscal Year: 2

Number of Complete Inspections this Fiscal Year: 1