

June 12, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: David Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2000 First Bi-annual Water Monitoring, Hiawatha Coal Company, Hiawatha Mine, C/007/011-WQ00-1

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [] NO [X]
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

The Hiawatha Mines are not currently being mined, but mining is planned for the future. The permit was transferred from U.S. Fuel Company to Hiawatha Coal Company (HCC) on December 12, 1997. The permit was reissued on March 14, 2002. Currently, HCC is monitoring for more constituents than is required by the current mine plan. The reduced monitoring requirements were set for U.S. Fuel company, while they were in temporary cessation. According to the MRP, HCC is required to collect samples and monitor surface and groundwater constituents two times per year as outlined in Table VII-13 and Table VII-20.

Data was reported for all groundwater sites. Data was reported for all surface water monitoring sites, however, there is a situation that exists that allows the operator to comply with the water monitoring schedule, yet circumvent the total collection of data. The operator is required to monitor monthly for surface sites and collect water samples for analysis two times per year.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling due date March 14, 2007

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [X] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All parameters were reported for groundwater. During July and August for ST-2 and June and July for ST-3, no flows were reported, however, field parameters for these sites were reported. The operator should be asked why these flows were not reported.

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [] NO [X]
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

As mentioned, the missing data. No irregularities were found in the data submitted.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [] NO [X]
2nd month, YES [] NO [X]
3rd month, YES [] NO [X]

Identify sites and months not monitored:

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES [] NO [X]
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

I could not find the DMR reports for January, February and March.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES [] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Only as mentioned above

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

The operator is under a Division Order to update the PHC and Mine Plan to identify any hydrologic changes since the mine closed, and which will also identify potential impacts where mining will take place in the future. The new information will have to be evaluated to determine if new sites and more monitoring should be required in the future.

Page 3
C/007/011-WQ00-1
June 12, 2003

The DMR,s should be found and evaluated and data included in the database if possible.

O:\007011.HIA\WATER QUALITY\WQ_00-1.DOC