MINE INSPECTION REPORT

☒ PERMITTED MINE SITE  ☐ UNPERMITTED MINE SITE

1. MINE NAME: Triangle Quarry  2. MINE LOCATION: Harrison Avenue
3. COUNTY: Wake  4. RIVER BASIN: Neuse
5. CASE:
7. ADDRESS: P.O. Box 190  Knightdale, North Carolina 27545
8. MINING PERMIT #: 92-10 ☐ N/A 9. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE: X N/A
10. PERSON(S) CONTACTED AT SITE: Cole Atkins
11. PICTURES? ☒ Yes ☐ No  TAKEN BY:
12. TYPE OF INSPECTION:
   ☐ A. Initial Inspection (Unpermitted Mine Sites)
   ☒ B. Routine Inspection (Permitted Mine Sites)
   ☐ C. Follow-up Inspection
13. Date of last inspection: 07/16/2017
14. Any mining since that date? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, cite evidence of such mining activity:
   Equipment was in operation at time of inspection.
15. Was mine operating at time of inspection? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, explain: See above.
16. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
   If no, explain:
17. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
   If no, explain:
18. Is there any off-site damage? ☐ A. Yes ☐ B. No ☒ C. None observed
   If A, describe the type and severity of the damage:
   If B or C, is there potential for offsite damage? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   Explain:
19. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: None
20. Other recommendations and comments: Recently seeded area between plant and office noted.
   Turbidity curtain in pond noted.
21. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? ☒ Yes ☐ No (Explain) ☐ Not Reviewed ☐ N/A
22. Follow-up inspection needed? ☐ Yes ☒ No
23. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report
24. Proposed date
   Copy of Report sent to operator 10/31/2019

INSPECTED BY: Joe Dupree
Telephone No: (919) 791-4200
DATE 10/30/2019

Copy to file  Copy to operator  Copy to Mining Specialist
Summary of observations during site visit to Wake Stone Triangle Quarry (92-10)

Date: 04-05-2019

ON SITE: 11:15 AM (approx.)

OFF SITE: 1:00 PM (approx.)

Weather: 58 degrees; steady moderate rainfall

Summary: Met with David Lee who is the Environmental Manager for Wake Stone at the mine office building. We briefly reviewed the plan set for the mine site and discussed how the mined stone is processed at the site.

The inspection was limited to the areas of the mine site with the potential to impact water quality in the locations referenced in the complaint from Mr. Morris. This included the stone processing area and process water settling ponds, the process water reservoir, the bypass channel, and the North Pond. The bypass channel runs from a culvert under I-40 roughly southwest to northeast through the middle of the permitted area around the process water reservoir to the North Pond. The North Pond is the pond downstream of the process water reservoir. We then walked the receiving channel downstream of the North Pond to its confluence with Crabtree Creek. Alleged accumulation of fines from the mine's stone processing plant in this channel was the subject of the complaint (which included the video posted on YouTube).

Regarding the processing plant area, the water used in washing the stone is confined within a closed-loop system. The runoff produced at the wash screen drains into the process water settling ponds which subsequently drain to the process water reservoir. Most of the fines carried by the runoff settle out into the settling ponds. Any that don't are carried to the reservoir. The water in the reservoir is then reused to wash the stone. The reservoir has an emergency spillway, but Mr. Lee reports that it has not been activated since Hurricane Fran in 1996. Because of this closed-loop approach, none of the process water ever has an opportunity to leave the site.

There are some places where sediment-laden runoff from the mine haul roads and other open areas may enter the bypass channel. The day of the inspection, there was a steady downpour of rain and I did not observe an excessive amount of sediment entering this channel. As I stated before, the bypass channel flows around the process water reservoir and discharges to the North Pond. There was evidence of previous years of deposition of material in the form of a sand bar in the headwaters of the North Pond. Using the age of the woody vegetation growing on this sand bar as a gauge, this has probably been accumulating very slowly over the last 30+ years. This indicates that the North Pond has been very effectively trapping/settling particles in the runoff from the mine site and (upstream of the mine) for many years. To my knowledge, Wake Stone has reported no parameter exceedances as a result of periodic water sampling and testing under their NPDES permit. A review of stormwater records would be needed to confirm this.

In summary, I found no violations either of the mining permit or NPDES SW permit on the day of my visit. I further observed that the visual quality in the stream flowing from the North Pond was virtually indistinguishable from visual quality of the water flowing in Crabtree Creek just upstream of the confluence of these two channels.

Respectfully submitted by: Bill Denton
MINE INSPECTION REPORT

☐ PERMITTED MINE SITE  ☐ UNPERMITTED MINE SITE

1. MINE NAME: Triangle Quarry  2. MINE LOCATION: Harrison Avenue, Cary, NC
3. COUNTY: Wake  4. RIVER BASIN: Neuse
5. CASE:

6. OPERATOR: Wake Stone Corporation  ATTN: Cole Atkins-Geologist
7. ADDRESS: P.O. Box 190  Knightdale, North Carolina 27545

8. MINING PERMIT #: 92-10  ☐ N/A  9. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE: March 30, 2021  ☐ N/A
10. PERSON(S) CONTACTED AT SITE: David Lee, Cole Atkins
11. PICTURES? ☐ Yes  ☐ No  TAKEN BY:

12. TYPE OF INSPECTION:
   ☐ A. Initial Inspection (Unpermitted Mine Sites)
      1. Size of affected land: ______ ac. (attach sketch map)
      2. How was this area measured? Measured by:
   ☐ B. Routine Inspection (Permitted Mine Sites)
   ☐ C. Follow-up Inspection

13. Date of last inspection: ____________
14. Any mining since that date? ☒ Yes ☐ No  If yes, cite evidence of such mining activity:
   Equipment was operating at time of inspection.
15. Was mine operating at time of inspection? ☐ Yes ☐ No  If yes, explain: As stated above, equipment was operating at time of inspection.
16. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? ☒ Yes  No ☐ N/A  If no, explain:

17. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? ☒ Yes  No ☐ N/A
   If no, explain:

18. Is there any off-site damage? ☐ A. ☐ Yes  ☐ B. ☒ No  ☐ C. ☐ None observed
   If A, describe the type and severity of the damage:
   If B or C, is there potential for offsite damage? ☒ Yes  ☐ No  Explain:
19. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: None

20. Other recommendations and comments: Site is in very good condition. Vegetated berms look good. Thanks for your cooperation.

21. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? ☐ Yes ☐ No (Explain) ☒ Not Reviewed  ☐ N/A

22. Follow-up inspection needed? ☐ Yes  ☒ No  Proposed date
23. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 24. Copy of Report sent to operator

INSPECTED BY: Joe Dupree  Telephone No: 919-791-4208

DATE July 6, 2017

Copy to file  Copy to operator  Copy to Mining Specialist
MINE INSPECTION REPORT

☐ PERMITTED MINE SITE  ☐ UNPERMITTED MINE SITE

1. MINE NAME: Triangle Quarry  2. MINE LOCATION: 222 Star Ln Cary
3. COUNTY: Wake  4. RIVER BASIN: Neuse
5. CASE: 

6. OPERATOR: Wake Stone Corp.
7. ADDRESS: PO Box 190 Knightdale, NC 27545

8. MINING PERMIT #: 92-10 ☐ N/A 9. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE: 03/30/2021 ☐ N/A

10. PERSON(S) CONTACTED AT SITE: 

11. PICTURES? ☐ Yes ☐ No TAKEN BY: 

12. TYPE OF INSPECTION:
   ☐ A. Initial Inspection (Unpermitted Mine Sites)
      1. Size of affected land: __________ ac. (attach sketch map)
      2. How was this area measured? __________ Measured by: __________
   ☐ B. Routine Inspection (Permitted Mine Sites)
   ☐ C. Follow-up Inspection

13. Date of last inspection: 06/03/2015

14. Any mining since that date? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, cite evidence of such mining activity: Mining ongoing 

15. Was mine operating at time of inspection? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, explain: Mining at time of inspection 

16. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
   If no, explain: 

17. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
   If no, explain: 

18. Is there any off-site damage? A. ☐ Yes B.X ☐ No C. ☐ None observed
   If A, describe the type and severity of the damage: 

   If B or C, is there potential for offsite damage? ☐ Yes ☐ No Explain: 

19. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: 

20. Other recommendations and comments: As discussed during the inspection walk through, vegetating the access road along the West side of the project near TST-1 & TST-2 would be beneficial 

21. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? ☐ Yes ☐ No (Explain) ☐ Not Reviewed ☐ N/A

22. Follow-up inspection needed? ☐ Yes X ☐ No Proposed date ________

23. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 0  

24. Copy of Report sent to operator __________________

INSPECTED BY: Thad Valentine (Multi Media Group) DATE 06/08/2015
Telephone No: (919) 791-4200

Copy to file  Copy to operator  Copy to Mining Specialist
**MINING MINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINE NAME</th>
<th>Triangle Quarry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATOR</td>
<td>Wake Stone Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>Wake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>PO Box 190 Knightdale, NC 27545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE</td>
<td>04/20/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVER BASIN</td>
<td>Neuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Was mine operating at time of inspection? ☒ Yes  ☐ No
10. Pictures?  ☐ Yes ☒ No
11. Date last inspected: 07/03/02
12. Any mining since last inspection? ☒ Yes  ☐ No
13. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If no, explain:

14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If no, explain:

15. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage: **N/A**

16. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: **None needed**.

17. Other recommendations and comments:

18. Is the Annual Reclamation Report on file accurate? ☒ Yes  ☐ No (Explain)  ☐ Not Reviewed

19. Follow-up inspection needed?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No  
   Proposed date: 1/1
20. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 0
21. Copy of Report sent to operator 06/28/04

INSPECTED BY: William H. Denton  DATE 06/28/04

Telephone No: (919) 571-4700  White copy to file  Pink copy to Mining Specialist

Yellow copy to operator  10/97
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources,
Division of Land Resources, Land Quality Section

MINE INSPECTION REPORT
(PERMITTED MINE)

1. MINE NAME  TriAngle Quarry  2. MINING PERMIT #  92-10
3. OPERATOR  Wake Stone Corp.  4. COUNTY  Wake
5. ADDRESS  P.O. Box 190  Knightdale, NC  27545
6. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE  04/20/2011  7. RIVER BASIN  NUSE # 1/03-04-02
8. Person(s) contacted at site  Mike Williams
9. Was mine operating at time of inspection?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
10. Pictures?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No
11. Date last inspected:  07/25/01  12. Any mining since last inspection?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
13. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
If no, explain:

14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
If no, explain:

15. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No
If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:

16. Corrective measures needed and/or taken:

17. Other recommendations and comments:  Refer to enclosed construction detail for possible solution to erosion problems along perimeter roads.

18. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +Ω map accurate?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No (Explain)  ☐ Not Reviewed

19. Follow-up inspection needed?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No  Proposed date:  
20. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report 1  21. Copy of Report sent to operator 07/23/02

INSPECTED BY:  William H. Denton, Jr.  DATE 07/03/02
Telephone No: (919) 571-4700

White copy to file  Yellow copy to operator  Pink copy to Mining Specialist 10/97
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, 
Division of Land Resources, Land Quality Section

MINE INSPECTION REPORT
(PERMITTED MINE)

1. MINE NAME  TRIANGLE QUARRY  
2. MINING PERMIT #  92-10
3. OPERATOR  WAKE STONE CORP.  
4. COUNTY  WAKE
5. ADDRESS  PO BOX 190
6. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE  Apr. 20, 2011  
7. RIVER BASIN  NEUSE #1 (03-04-02)
8. Person(s) contacted at site  David F. Lee  
   Gisler  Environmental Supervisor

9. Was mine operating at time of inspection?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
10. Pictures?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
11. Date last inspected:  04/24/95
12. Any mining since last inspection?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
13. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If no, explain:

14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No
   If no, explain:

15. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
   If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:

16. Corrective measures needed and/or taken:

17. Other recommendations and comments:

18. Is the Annual Reclamation Report map accurate?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No (Explain)  ☐ Not Reviewed

19. Follow-up inspection needed?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No
   Proposed date  1/1
20. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report  0
   21. Copy of Report sent to operator  08/02/01

INSPECTED BY:  [Signature]  DATE  07/25/01

Telephone No:  (919) 571-4700

White copy to file  Yellow copy to operator  Pink copy to Mining Specialist  10/97
MEMORANDUM

TO: File, Triangle Quarry (92-10)

FROM: John Holley, Regional Engineer

SUBJECT: Site Visit
March 22, 1996

As a follow-up to an inquiry from the Crabtree Creek Streamwatch, I visited the site with David Lee of Wake Stone to see if any perimeter problems were evident with sediment basins or traps. We found all structures to be in good condition, and no signs of recent soil loss were observed. The previously repaired slope along the creek was in excellent condition.

It appears that the inquiry came as a result of a casual observation of an old pond on the property below the active mine site and near the park. This pond is exempt from the Dam Safety Law of 1967, and was breached before any mining was initiated at the site. I remember seeing the pond during initial site visits when we were evaluating the original plans for the site. The breach is at the right abutment of the dam, and is down to firm material at its base. Although the old PS pipes are exposed due to past erosion, the breach is relatively stable with leaf litter, pine straw and other native cover, as well as exposed weathered and competent rock at the downstream end. This area serves as a spillway for the remnant of the pond, and I did not notice any significant changes in it since I last saw it some 10 years ago. Beavers have built a small dam across the upstream end of the opening, but no problems were observed. Wake Stone chose long ago to leave this dam undisturbed within their buffer along the park because repairing it would involve a significant land-disturbing activity in that vicinity.

I notified the Streamwatch coordinator that no problems were found and that no follow-up action is required.

JLH
MINE INSPECTION REPORT
(PERMITTED MINE)

1. MINE NAME

2. MINING PERMIT# 92-10

3. OPERATOR

4. COUNTY

5. ADDRESS

6. PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE 4-1-2001

7. Person(s) contacted at site

8. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes No

9. Pictures? Yes No

10. Date last inspected: 4/12/98

11. Any mining since last inspection? Yes No

12. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? Yes No

If no, explain:

13. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? Yes No

If no, explain:

14. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? Yes No

If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:

15. Corrective measures needed and/or taken:

16. Other recommendations and comments:

17. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? Yes No (Explain) No Reviewed

18. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No

Proposed date 1/5/98

19. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report

20. Copy of Report sent to operator 5/18/94 (date)

INSPECTED BY: Tim Holcomb

Phone No: (919) 571 4700

DATE 5/18/94

White copy to file

Yellow copy to operator

Pink copy to Mining Specialist

9/91
# MINE INSPECTION REPORT

(PERMITTED MINE)

1. **MINE NAME**: Triangles Company  
2. **MINING PERMIT**: 92-10

3. **OPERATOR**: W. W. Smith  
4. **COUNTY**: Wake

5. **ADDRESS**: P.O. Box 140, Raleigh, NC 27613  
6. **PERMIT EXPIRATION DATE**: 1-1-2001

7. Person(s) contacted at site: [Blank]

8. Was mine operating at time of inspection? ☑ Yes ☐ No  
9. Pictures? ☑ Yes ☐ No

10. Date last inspected: 1-3-1972  
11. Any mining since last inspection? ☑ Yes ☐ No

12. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If no, explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Blank]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If no, explain:

| [Blank] |

14. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? ☑ Yes ☐ No  
If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:

| [Blank] |

15. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: [Blank]

| [Blank] |

16. **Other recommendations and comments**: Work is continuing on perimeter berm, seeding throughout the quarry looks very good, all sediment control devices are well maintained.

17. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? ☑ Yes ☐ No (Explain) ☑ Not Reviewed

| [Blank] |

18. Follow-up inspection needed? ☑ Yes ☐ No  
Proposed date: [Blank]

19. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report: [Blank]  
20. Copy of Report sent to operator: [Blank] (date)

**INSPECTED BY**: [Signature]  
**DATE**: 4/1/86

**Phone No:** (919) 526-4200

*White copy to file  Yellow copy to operator  Pink copy to Mining Specialist*
North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources,
Division of Land Resources, Land Quality Section

**MINE INSPECTION REPORT**
(PERMITTED MINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. MINE NAME</th>
<th>TRIANGLE QUARRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. MINING PERMIT #</td>
<td>92-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OPERATOR</td>
<td>WAKE STONE CORP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COUNTY</td>
<td>WAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ADDRESS</td>
<td>P.O. BOX 190 KIGHTSDALE NC 27545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Person(s) contacted at site</td>
<td>DAVID LEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was mine operating at time of inspection?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pictures?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Date last inspected:</td>
<td>6/30/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Any mining since last inspection?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, explain:

12. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? | Yes | No |

If no, explain:

13. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? | Yes | No |

If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:

14. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: SLOPE WORK AND CRABTREE HAS BEEN STABILIZED

15. Other recommendations and comments: SEDIMENT MTS ARE BEING WELL MAINTAINED.

16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/ - map accurate? | Yes | No (Explain) | Not Reviewed |

17. Follow-up inspection needed? | Yes | No |

Proposed date ______/_____/______

18. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report ______.

19. Copy of Report sent to operator 6/14/89 (date)

INSPECTED BY: Tim Holland

Phone No: (919) 571-4700

White copy to file
Yellow copy to operator
Pink copy to Mining Specialist
## MINE INSPECTION REPORT
### (PERMITTED MINE)

1. **MINE NAME**: [ARM] TRAINGLE QUARRY  
2. **MINING PERMIT #**: 92-10  
3. **OPERATOR**: [NAME] STONE CORP.  
4. **COUNTY**: WAKE  
5. **ADDRESS**: P.O. BOX 190 KNIGHTDALE, NC 27545  
6. **Person(s) contacted at site**: TED BRATTON  
7. **Was mine operating at time of inspection?**  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No  
8. **Pictures?**  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [x] No  
9. **Date last inspected**: 1/24/92  
10. **Any mining since last inspection?**  
    - [x] Yes  
    - [ ] No  
11. **Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit?**  
    - [x] Yes  
    - [ ] No  

   **If no, explain:**  
   - THE BUFFER ZONE HAS BEEN RESTORED AND RE-SEEDED  

12. **Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit?**  
    - [ ] Yes  
    - [x] No  

   **If no, explain:**  

13. **Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage?**  
    - [ ] Yes  
    - [x] No  

   If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:  

14. **Corrective measures needed and/or taken:**  
   - REMEDIAL PLAN HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT SUFFICIENT TO CORRECT THE BUFFER DEFICIENCY.  
   - THE AFFECTED AREA MUST BE MONITORED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF VEGETATIVE COVER AND COMPLETION OF TREE PLANTING.  

15. **Other recommendations and comments:**  
   - THE SEATING PLANT MUST BE REVIEWED AND APPLIED BEFORE BLADING CAN BE RESUMED ALONG THE WEST HIGHWAY.  

16. **Is the Annual Reclamation Report + / - map accurate?**  
    - [ ] Yes  
    - [x] No (Explain)  
    - [x] Not Reviewed  

17. **Follow-up inspection needed?**  
    - [x] Yes  
    - [ ] No  

   **Proposed date:** 2/7/92  

18. **No. of additional pages of Inspection Report**  
   - 0  

19. **Copy of Report sent to operator**  
   - 1/24/92  

   **INSPECTED BY:**  
   - [NAME] HOLLEY  
   - [NAME] BARBEE  

   **DATE:** 1/24/92  

   **Phone No:** (919) 571-4700  

   **White copy to file**  
   **Yellow copy to operator**  
   **Pink copy to Mining Specialist**  

   **Given:**  

   **Date:**
MINE INSPECTION REPORT
(PERMITTED MINE)

1. MINE NAME: TRIANGLE QUARRY
2. MINING PERMIT #: 92-10
3. OPERATOR: WAKE STONE CORP.
4. COUNTY: WAKE
5. ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 190 KNIGHTDALE, N.C. 27545
6. Person(s) contacted at site: JOHN and TED BULSTON, DAVID LEE
7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? ☑ Yes ☐ No
8. Pictures? ☑ Yes ☐ No
9. Date last inspected: 3/27/90
10. Any mining since last inspection? ☐ Yes ☑ No
11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? ☑ Yes ☐ No
   If no, explain:

   ☑ B. E. O.: THE UNDISTURBED BUFFER ALONG CRABTREE CREEK AT THE WEST END OF THE SITE HAS NOT PROVIDED ADEQUATE PROTECTION TO THE RECENT ROCK SLIDE HAS RESULTED IN MATERIAL DEPOSITED IN CRABTREE CREEK.

12. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? ☑ Yes ☐ No
   If no, explain:

13. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? ☑ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage: ROCK MATERIAL AND SOME SLIGHT SOIL MATERIAL, LOST INTO CRABTREE CREEK BELOW SLIDE AREA. ROCK EXTENDS APPROX. 90% ACROSS CREEK. CREEK IS NOT COMPLETELY BLOCKED.


15. Other recommendations and comments:
   THANK YOU FOR YOUR EXPEDITIOUS REPORT OF THIS ACCIDENT TO US AND YOUR COOPERATION. EXPIRATION DATE: 4-1-2001. SAFE WORK IN EXPANSION AREA IS EXCELLENT.

16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report + / - map accurate? ☐ Yes ☐ No (Explain) ☑ Not Reviewed

17. Follow-up inspection needed? ☑ Yes ☐ No
   Proposed date: 11/5/92

18. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report


INSPECTED BY: JOHN KOLLEY, SELLVILLE, FRANK DAY

Phone No: (919) 571-4700

White copy to file
Yellow copy to operator
Pink copy to Mining Specialist
MINE INSPECTION REPORT
(PERMITTED MINE)

1. MINE NAME: CARY QUARRY
2. MINING PERMIT #: 92-10
3. OPERATOR: WAKE STONE CORP
4. COUNTY
5. ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 190, KNAIGHTDALE, NC 27545
6. Person(s) contacted at site: DAVID LEE
7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? □ Yes □ No
8. Pictures? □ Yes □ No
9. Date last inspected: 6/30/89
10. Any mining since last inspection? □ Yes □ No
11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? □ Yes □ No
   If no, explain:

12. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? □ Yes □ No
   If no, explain:

13. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:

14. Corrective measures needed and/or taken:
   BASINS AND SILT FENCES HAVE BEEN INSTALLED ALONG THE
   WESTERN BOUNDARY OF THE PIT TO PROVIDE PROTECTION
   DURING THE RELOCATION OF THE MAIN ROAD. THESE ARE
   IMPORTANT TEMPORARY DEVICES AND SHOULD BE CHECKED
   FREQUENTLY AND MAINTAINED.

15. Other recommendations and comments:

16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? □ Yes □ No (Explain) □ Not Reviewed

17. Follow-up inspection needed? □ Yes □ No
   Proposed date

18. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report

19. Copy of Report sent to operator 3/27/90

INSPECTED BY: GERRICK WEAVER DATE: 3/27/90
Phone No: (703) 2314

White copy to file Yellow copy to operator Pink copy to Mining Specialist
REV. 9/96
North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development
Division of Land Resources, Land Quality Section

MINE INSPECTION REPORT
(PERMITTED MINE)

1. MINE NAME: T.R. HALE QUARRY
2. MINING PERMIT #: 92-10
3. OPERATOR: WAKE STONE CORP.
4. COUNTY: WAKE
5. ADDRESS: P.O. Box 190 Knightdale NC 27545
6. Person(s) contacted at site: TED BRYSON
7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? [] Yes [] No
8. Pictures? [] Yes [] No
9. Date last inspected: 4/12/88
10. Any mining since last inspection? [] Yes [] No
11. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the Permit? [] Yes [] No
   If no, explain:

12. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the Permit? [] Yes [] No
   If no, explain:

13. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite damage? [] Yes [] No
    If yes, describe the type and severity of the damage:

14. Corrective measures needed and/or taken: THE OVERBURDEN BULK IS BEING RECLAIMED AS REQUESTED IN THE LAST INSPECTION REPORT.

15. Other recommendations and comments: SITE LOOKS VERY GOOD.

16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report +/- map accurate? [] Yes [] No (Explain) [] Not Reviewed

17. Follow-up inspection needed? [] Yes [] No
   Proposed date: __/__/__

18. No. of additional pages of Inspection Report: __
19. Copy of Report sent to operator: __/__/__ (date)

INSPECTED BY: ______________
DATE: __/30/89

Phone No: ( )

White copy to file
Yellow copy to operator
Pink copy to Mining Specialist

REV. 9/88
1. Operator: WAKE STONE
2. Mine Name: TRIANGLE
3. County: WAKE
4. Is site permitted? Yes / No
5. Permit No.: 92-10
6. Person(s) Contacted: TED BRATTON
7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? Yes / No
8. Pictures? Yes / No
9. Date Last Inspected: 6/27/70
10. Any mining since last inspection? Yes / No
11. If mine is not under permit cite evidence of recent mining activity:

12. Are public safety provisions in compliance with the permit? Yes / No
13. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the permit?
   Yes / No
   If no, explain:

14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the permit?
   Yes / No
   If no, explain:

15. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite sedimentation?
   Yes / No
   If yes, what measures are needed:

16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report and map accurate? Yes / No
    If no,
    explain:

17. Other recommendations and comments:
    SITE IS IN EXCELLENT SHAPE,
    DAM IS NEARING COMPLETION, RECOMMEND THAT IMPROVEMENT
    PERMIT BE ISSUED. THE ACTIVE OVERBURNED PILE SHOULD
    BE SEENED AS SOON AS IT IS COMPLETE BUT NO LATER THAN
    THIS FALL.
18. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes / No
    Proposed date:
19. Copy of report sent to operator? Yes / No
    No. of add’l pages

INSPECTED BY: [Signature]
DATE: 4/120/88
MINE INSPECTION REPORT
Land Quality Section

1. Operator: **Wake Stone**
2. Mine Name: **Triangle Quarry**
3. County: **Wake**
4. Is site permitted? **Yes**
5. Permit No.: **92-10**
6. Person(s) Contacted: **Ted Brauton**
7. Was mine operating at time of inspection? **Yes**
8. Pictures? **Yes**
9. Date Last Inspected: **7/18/87**
10. Any mining since last inspection? **No**
11. If mine is not under permit cite evidence of recent mining activity:

   [Blank Line]

12. Are public safety provisions in compliance with the permit? **Yes**
13. Is the mine in compliance with the Operating Conditions of the permit? **Yes**
   If no, explain: **But Site Was Dusty (2-C)**

14. Is the mine in compliance with the Reclamation Conditions of the permit? **Yes**
   If no, explain: **Berm on Western End of Property is Nearing Completion. Brush Barrier & Diversion appears to have been adequate (Marginal). The slopes along haul road on west side of pit must be provided w/ground cover.**
15. Did any of the above deficiencies result in offsite sedimentation? **Yes**
   If yes, what measures are needed? **Offsite sed was minor & has been corrected. Existing pits below haul road (west of pit) should be provided with stone filters and divsions. slopes must be stabilized.**
16. Is the Annual Reclamation Report and map accurate? **Yes**
   If no, explain:

   [Blank Line]

17. Other recommendations and comments: **Don't use brush barriers for sediment control.**

18. Follow-up inspection needed? **Yes**
   Proposed date: **October 87**
19. Copy of report sent to operator? **Yes**
   **7/21/87**
   No. of add'l pages__

INSPECTED BY: [Signature] DATE: **6/22/87**
DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCES

February 4, 1987

Mr. John Bratton  
Wake Stone Corporation  
Post Office Box 190  
Knightdale, NC 27545

RE: Sedimentation Complaint  
Wake Stone Triangle Quarry  
Wake County

Dear Mr. Bratton:

In response to a citizen's complaint of sediment getting into Crabtree Creek from the Triangle Quarry, I inspected the site adjacent to the Creek on February 2, 1987.

I found that spoil material from a large berm is indeed getting into the Creek. Some sediment has gotten through the buffer area at the toe of the slope but the majority of it is leaving the site via several drainage ways.

It was noted that attempts have been made to control the sediment by installing silt fences and hay bales. These measures are inadequate and in some cases have already failed.

Due to this being a rather a large site and in a critical location due to its proximity to Crabtree Creek, it is important that steps be taken immediately to correct the situation. It appears that the first step is to construct sediment basins with stone and gravel filters at the drainage outlets. The next and most important step is to permanently stabilize the berm. This will involve grading the slopes at an angle that will support vegetation.

3800 Barrett Drive, PO Box 27687, Raleigh, N.C. 27611-7687  Telephone 919-733-2314

An Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Employer
Mr. Bratton  
February 4, 1987

If needed, I can meet with you or a representative on the site to discuss needed measures.

Please let me know of your intentions as soon as possible. I am at 733-2314.

Sincerely,

Tim Holland  
Asst. Regional Engineer  
Land Quality Section  
Raleigh Regional Office
2. Mine: Triangle Quarry
3. Person Contacted: Ted Bratton
4. Permit No. 92-10
5. Date Inspected: 2-12-87
6. Pictures: Videotape __ Slides __ Other __
7. Was mine active on date of inspection? Yes __ No __
8. Erosion Control Measures taken: Sediment pits at toe of unstabilized berm have been cleaned out and repaired.
9. Describe any offsite damage: Undetermined amount of sediment lost downstream due to inadequate and failed measures. No visible siltation noted at time of inspection.
10. Are public safety provisions in compliance with permit? Yes
11. Waste Disposal measures taken: A berm adjacent to I-40 is being constructed with waste material.
12. Is Annual Reclamation Report form accurate? Yes __ No __
13. Reclamation accomplished since last inspection: No. of acres __ Berm next to I-40 has been planted with pines.
14. Reclamation measures needed: Remainder of berm must be stabilized.
15. Other recommendations & comments: Continue to maintain measures next to Crabtree Creek. Continue to maintain & tailings ponds. Recommended to Mr. Bratton to use kespedia in areas not being stabilized or reclaimed with pines.
16. Were recommendations made to operator at site? Yes __ No __
17. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes __ No __
18. Copy sent to operator? Yes __ 2-18-87 (date) No __
19. INSPECTED BY: Jim Holkow
MINE INSPECTION REPORT
Land Quality Section
Raleigh Regional Office
3800 Barrett Drive
Raleigh, NC 17611
(919) 733-2314

1. Company: Wake Stone
   2. County: Wake

3. Mine: Cary Quarry
   4. Permit No. 92-10

5. Person Contacted: Ted Bratton
   6. Date Inspected 6-27-86

7. Pictures: Videotape Slides Other

8. Was mine active on date of inspection? Yes ✓ No

9. Erosion Control Measures taken. Existing Ponds & Settling Basins

10. Describe any offsite damage. None noted

11. Are public safety provisions in compliance with permit? No

12. Waste Disposal measures taken. Berms

13. Is Annual Reclamation Report form accurate? Yes ✓ No

   If no, explain

14. Reclamation accomplished since last inspection. No. of acres

   4 Acres of Berms Seeded & Mulched

15. Reclamation measures needed.

16. Other recommendations & comments: Looking good

17. Were recommendations made to operator at site? Yes No

18. Follow-up inspection needed? Yes No

19. Copy sent to operator? Yes ✓ 7-1-86 (date) No

INSPECTED BY: Tony Lane/ Wake Brown
May 22, 1984

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Stevens

FROM: Steve Conrad S & C

SUBJECT: Inspection of Wake Stone Cary Quarry

Pursuant to our discussions on May 18, 1984, an inspection was made of the Cary Quarry on May 21, 1984. Additionally, the concerns expressed May 18, were discussed with the mine operator.

Problems with truck traffic crossing the centerline were discussed. Wake Stone has indicated that Landmark Associates had plans to develop the property across Reedy Creek Road from the intersection of the Wake Stone access road. The development plans include a redesign of the intersection which may alleviate the truck traffic crossover. Perhaps we can discuss this redesign with Landmark and Wake Stone.

Concerning the reported blasting vibrations, Wake Stone blasted at 1:30 p.m. on April 6, 1984 not at 12:00 p.m. The company’s seismograph record for the blast taken at Landmark Engineering across I-40 showed practically no vibration and little air blast. Wake Stone did not blast at all on April 10, 1984, the other date reported. Please check to see if 12:00 p.m. April 6 and 12:30 p.m. April 10 are the correct times. Another possibility for a source of blasting is construction blasting for a pipeline under construction on the south side of I-40 during this period. Wake Stone indicated that the park ranger should feel free to notify them immediately of any problem with blasting as it is easier to investigate the complaint then.

No water was found ponding on the outside of the berm although marsh grass was noted. At this point, we don’t feel that additional drainage warrants destroying the adjoining vegetation. However, Wake Stone was advised to monitor the situation and provide drainage if ponding occurs.

Additional vegetative screening was discussed and Wake Stone asked for recommendations. We suggested that your landscaping experts should participate in any recommendations. We will be happy to arrange a meeting to discuss any recommendations with Wake Stone. Construction of the berm along I-40 is on-schedule and is expected to be finished by this fall.

Although Wake Stone acknowledged that they were ahead of their projected production schedule, they could not yet say when the primary crusher could be relocated into the pit.
MEMORANDUM
Jim Stevens
Page 2
May 22, 1984

The mine operator does intend to operate on Memorial Day (May 28). However, they have instituted a policy of not operating at all on Saturdays except for special requests. We did advise them that any request for a variance to operate on times prohibited by permit should be made as far in advance as possible.

Overall, the quarry was found to be in good order and in compliance with the permit on May 21, 1984.

I believe that this addresses the concerns mentioned during the May 18 meeting. We will be happy to coordinate any follow-up discussions on visual screening and intersection redesign.

SC/JS/cj

cc: Paula Burger
INCREASE STONE County: WAKE

Date Inspected: 1-5-84 Date of last inspection: 5-17-83

Product: CRUSHED STONE Person Contacted: JOHN BRATTAN

I. Remarks - Measures Taken

A. Erosion Control: EXISTINGponds, SETTING BASINS

B. Waste Disposal: BERM

C. Reclamation: STABILIZATION OF COMPLETED AREAS ON-SITE AS WORK PROGRESSES; SEE PAST RESPONSES.

RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS:

SITE SUBSTANTIALLY IN COMPLIANCE W/ NO SERIOUS PROBLEMS OBSERVED.

LOOKED AT PLAN FOR BERM ALONG I-40 AS PROPOSED. 5-15 APPEARS SATISFACTORY.

Deficiency letter needed Letter sent Reinspection Needed
May 17, 1983

Mr. John Bratton, Jr.
Wake Stone Corporation
P. O. Box 190
Knightdale, N. C. 27545

RE: Cary Quarry
Wake County

Dear Mr. Bratton:

This letter will follow up our meeting and mine inspection of the Cary Quarry on May 17, 1983 in accordance with G.S. 74-56 of the Mining Act.

During our meeting, we discussed continuing noise abatement measures, extending the present berm to the south to provide additional screening, filling small pools of standing water, sediment control, paving the access road, and hauling material from the quarry on Saturday. Through our discussion with you and inspection, we have found that the agreed noise abatement measures have been taken and the existing lakes are still functioning for sediment control. You indicated that the access road will be paved in the near future and the pools will be backfilled and revegetated. We also discussed that hauling overburden from the site on Saturdays will be considered subject to mining permit condition number 5H. Additionally, we appreciate your consideration to extending the berm to the south.

A report of oil contaminated water discharge from your operation to Crabtree Creek was investigated. No evidence of any oil contaminated water discharge was found where your site drainages meets Crabtree Creek.

Thank you for your cooperation in these matters.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

James D. Simons, C.P.G.S., P.E.
Mining Specialist
LAND QUALITY SECTION

JDS:gf

cc: John Holley
INSPECTION REPORT

Company: WAKE STONE  County: WAKE
Mine: CARY QUARRY  Permit Number: 92-10
Date Inspected: 3-31-82  Date of last inspection: 3-7-82
Product: CRUSHED STONE  Person Contacted: JOHN BRATEN

I. Remarks - Measures Taken

A. Erosion Control: EXISTING PONDS AND ROCK FILTER PIT AT EASTERN DRAINAGE CHANNEL.

B. Waste Disposal: BERM

C. Reclamation: BERM AND EASTERN DRAINAGE CHANNEL HAVE BEEN SEEDED, MULCHED, AND TUCKED AS WELL AS ALTERATIONS TO N.E. POND DAM, SPILLWAY ON DAM, HAS BEEN LINED WITH RIP-RAP.

RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS:

No problems noted. Site is in compliance.
An existing waste fill at the SW corner of the property was discussed with Mr. Bratton. The crusher will occupy a portion of the top of the filled area. Mr. Bratton desires to construct a berm along the top of the area for screening and also wants to place fill on the slopes to flatten them and cover the exposed debris. Placing fill on the slope will involve a short section of stream diversion; however, the stream drains to the sediment pond. I noted that I didn’t cover.

Deficiency letter needed  Letter sent  Reinspection Needed
THINK THIS WOULD BE ANY PROBLEM FROM THE
STANDPOINT OF THE MINING ACT AS LONG AS
THE CONDITIONS OF THE MINING PERMIT ARE
NOT VIOLATED IN THE PROCESS. IT WAS AGREED
THAT I WOULD CHECK THIS THROUGH
JIM SIMONS BEFORE THE ACTIVITY IS UNDERTAKEN

NOTE: JIM SIMONS AND STEVE CONRAD VISITED
SITE 4-2-82 AND OBSERVED THE AREA DESCRIBED
ABOVE. IN A CONVERSATION WITH JIM, I WAS
INFORMED THAT THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY IN THE
AREA IS ACCEPTABLE PROVIDED THAT FILL PLACED
MENT AND STREAM RELLOCATION ARE ACCEPTABLE
TO ANY POTENTIALLY AFFECTED NEIGHBORS. JIM
ASKED ME TO PASS THIS ALONG TO MR.
BRATTON DURING MY NEXT CONVERSATION
WITH HIM.

THIS WAS ACCOMPLISHED 4-5-82.
INSP EC TED BY: JOHN HUNI EY

INSPECTION REPORT

Company: WAKE STONE
County: WAKE

Mine: CARY QUARRY
Permit Number: 72-10

Date Inspected: 4-22-82
Date of last inspection: 5-3-31-82

Product: CRUSHED STONE
Person Contacted: JOHNNY BRITTEN

I. Remarks - Measures Taken
   A. Erosion Control: EXISTING PONDS

   B. Waste Disposal:
      ON-SITE FILL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF
      PLANT SITE - BERM IS COMPLETED TO
      EAST OF SITE.

   C. Reclamation:
      BERM AND EASTERN DRAINAGE CHANNEL
      HAVE BEEN STABILIZED; ALSO N.E. POND DAM.

RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS:

   NO PROBLEMS NOTED DURING
   Tに対SEDIMENT CONTROL. I INDICATED THAT JIM
   SIMONS (FOR PARK OFFICIALS)
   HAD EXPRESSED SOME CONCERN TO ME
   WITH RESPECT TO PONDING OF WATER
   IN THE EASTERN DRAINAGE CHANNEL. I
   REQUESTED THAT THESE AREAS BE OPENED FOR
   PROPER DRAINAGE + MR. BRITTEN AGREED.
   HE INDICATED THAT HE WOULD CONTACT OUR
   OFFICE AFTER THE PROBLEM HAS BEEN CORRECTED.

Deficiency letter needed _______ Letter sent _______ Reinspection Needed _______
INPECTION REPORT

Company: Wake Stone

Mine: Carver Quarry

Date Inspected: 5-17-82

Product: Crushed Stone

County: Wake

Permit Number: 92-10

Date of last inspection: 4-22-82

Person Contacted: Johnny Bratten

I. Remarks - Measures Taken

A. Erosion Control: Existing Ponds

B. Waste Disposal: On-site fill for plant construction & sold as borrow material

C. Reclamation: Berm and eastern drainage channel stabilized as well as N.E. Pond Dam

RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS:

No sediment control problems. Plant should be operational in about 1 month. Jim Simons had called again about ponding of surface water in eastern drainage ditch. Johnny Bratten has drained all but about 1/100' section at upper end. He indicated that he will contact our office once entire ditch is drained.

Deficiency letter needed __________ Letter sent __________ Reinspection Needed __________
INSPECTION REPORT

Company: WAKE STONE

County: WAKE

Mine: CARY QUARRY

Permit Number: 92-10

Date Inspected: 6-24-92

Date of last inspection: 5-17-92

Product: CRUSHED STONE

Person Contacted: BROWNING

I. Remarks - Measures Taken

A. Erosion Control: EXISTING PONDS

B. Waste Disposal: ON-SITE CONSTRUCTION FILL AT PLANT AREA & SOLD

C. Reclamation: BERM AND EASTERN DRAINAGE CHANNEL & N.E. POND DAM → NO OTHER NEW RECLAMATION

RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS: NO SERIOUS PROBLEMS.

→ N.E. POND DAM HAS A SIGNIFICANT GULLY ON THE D.S. SIDE WHICH NEEDS REPAIR

→ ALSO SEVERAL SIGNIFICANT GULLIES ARE FORMING ON BERMS WHICH NEED REPAIR.

→ THESE ITEMS WERE NOTED AT CONTRACTOR AT SITE AND A RECOMMENDATION WAS MADE TO CONTINUE W/ SEEDING OF COMPLETED SLOPES ASAP. HE CONFIRMED THEIR PLANS TO PROCEED IN THAT MANNER.

REINSPECTION IN ABOUT 1 MONTH

Deficiency letter needed _________ Letter sent _________ Reinspection Needed _________
INSPECTION REPORT

Company: WAKE STONE  County: WAKE
Mine: CARY QUARRY  Permit Number: 92-10
Date Inspected: 9-2-82  Date of last inspection: 6-24-82
Product: CRUSHED STONE  Person Contacted: BROWNING

I. Remarks - Measures Taken

A. Erosion Control: EXISTING PONDS + NEW SETTLING BASINS BELOW PLANT AREA

B. Waste Disposal: BERRNS + ON-SITE CONSTRUCTION FILL

C. Reclamation: BERM AND DRAINAGE CHANNEL TO EAST, BERM TO WEST, NE POND DAM, UPPER SLOPES OF PIT, ACCESS ROAD.

RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS: CONSTRUCTION ALMOST COMPLETE.
- EROSION PROBLEMS NOTED IN LAST REPORT HAVE RECEIVED SOME ATTENTION, HOWEVER, MORE IS NEEDED. NO SEDIMENT PROBLEMS NOTED.
- IT WAS SUGGESTED TO BROWNING THAT THE CREST OF THE NE POND DAM BE ALTERED TO PREVENT FLOW FROM CREST OVER D.S. FACE.
MR. BROWNING INDICATED THAT THEY WILL CONTINUE TO PROGRESS IN EROSION REPAIR & STABILIZATION.

I RECOMMEND AN INSPECTION AT THE FALL WHEN CONSTRUCTION IS COMPLETE.

Deficiency letter needed  NO  Letter sent  Reinspection Needed
INSPECTION REPORT

Company: WAKE STONE
Mine: CARY QUARRY
County: WAKE
Permit Number: 92-10
Date Inspected: 11-23-82
Date of last inspection: 9-2-82
Product: CRUSHED STONE
Person Contacted: JOHN BRATTEN

I. Remarks - Measures Taken

A. Erosion Control: EXISTING PONDS & NEW SETTLING BASINS

B. Waste Disposal: BERM & ON-SITE CONSTRUCTION FILL

C. Reclamation: BERM & DRAINAGE CHANNEL TO EAST BERM TO WEST, NE POND DAM, UPPER SLOPES OF PIT, ACCESS ROAD

RECOMMENDATIONS & COMMENTS: CONSTRUCTION ESSENTIALLY COMPLETE, SOME OPERATION UNDERWAY.

NO SEDIMENT PROBLEMS NOTED, COMPLETION OF EROSION REPAIRS IS NEEDED AT NE POND DAM AND AT EAST BERM IN PARTICULAR. PONDING AREA IN EASTERN DRAINAGE CHANNEL NEEDS TO BE DRAINED BY IMPROVEMENT OF CHANNEL.

NOISE ABATEMENT AND DUST CONTROL APPEARS OK.

Deficiency letter needed ___________ Letter sent ___________ Reinspection Needed ___________
November 24, 1982

Mr. John Bratton, Jr.
Wake Stone Corporation
Post Office Box 190
Knightdale, NC  27545

Dear Mr. Bratton:

RE: Cary Quarry (92-10)
Wake County

This is to confirm the results of our inspection of the subject site on November 23, 1982.

As we discussed, reclamation activities and conservation practices carried out to date were found to be in compliance with the provisions of your Mining Permit. We particularly appreciated your assistance with our inspection of the noise abatement measures carried out to date. The work you have done in this area is also in compliance with your permit.

The following items were noted which need your timely attention to insure continued compliance:

(1) Completion of repair and stabilization work for eroded areas at the Northeast Pond Dam and Eastern Berm.
(2) Improvement of drainage within the Eastern Drainage Channel to eliminate the ponding area adjacent to the park property.

In addition to the above, I would recommend that any planned additional seeding work proceed as soon as possible due to the rapidly approaching winter season.

Your cooperation in resolving these matters is appreciated. If there are any questions or if we can be of any assistance, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

John L. Holley, Jr.
Regional Engineer
Land Quality Section

JLH/mp

cc: Jim Simons
November 29, 1982

Mr. James D. Simons
Division of Land Resources
N. C. Dept. of Natural Resources & Community Development
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, N. C. 27611

Dear Jim:

I am writing to notify you that we have taken care of the recommendations you and John Holley made on your visit to Triangle Quarry last week. Also, please find enclosed a copy of the Bureau of Mines report regarding noise abatement. If you have any questions about the report, please don't hesitate to ask as we might be able to simplify some of Foster-Miller's descriptions.

Yours truly,

WAKE STONE CORPORATION

John R. Bratton

JRB/cw

Enclosures

RECEIVED
NOV 30 1982
LAND QUALITY SECTION
December 13, 1982

Mr. John R. Bratton
Wake Stone Corporation
P. O. Box 190
Knightdale, North Carolina  27545

Dear Mr. Bratton:

Thank you for sending a copy of the Bureau of Mines Report.

We appreciate your cooperation during the November 23rd inspection.

During a recent trip to Umstead Park, I did notice that the gulley on the berm at the park boundary had been filled and mulched. I also noticed that some effort had been made to drain the pools adjacent to the middle of the berm. However, the pools were still present on December 7th and apparently will require some additional effort to drain.

Again, we appreciate your cooperative spirit and look forward to following the progress on your quarry.

Sincerely,

James D. Simons, C.P.G.S., P.E.
Mining Specialist
LAND QUALITY SECTION

JDS:pg

cc:  John Holley