

June 12, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: David Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2002 First Bi-annual Water Monitoring, Hiawatha Coal Company, Hiawatha Mine, C/007/011-WQ02-1

- 1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?** YES [ X ] NO [ ]  
*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.

- 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:*

The operator is now sampling only those constituents that are identified in the MRP.

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

**5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?**  
1<sup>st</sup> month, YES [X] NO [ ]  
2<sup>nd</sup> month, YES [X] NO [ ]  
*Identify sites and months not monitored:* 3<sup>rd</sup> month, YES [X] NO [ ]

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

First and Second quarter DMR data was in the database for Mohrland Portal, 001 and Miller Creek, 002.

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

Some of the constituents were not reported. The operator should be asked to see if these parameters were evaluated. If so they should be reported.

**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, 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.

See 7. above.