

## 2002 Annual Report Review

**Permittee:** Lodestar Energy, Inc  
**Mine Name:** Horizon Mine  
**Permit Number:** C/007/020  
**Date Report Received:** March 7, 2003

Assigned Reviewers:	Date Completed ▼
Stephen J. Demczak	May 7, 2003
David Darby, Hydrology	6/14/03
Jerriann Ernstszen	August 6, 2003

**Instructions:** The assigned staff will review their respective portions of the Annual report and provide a written determination (findings) on how the mine has or has not met the permit requirements for reporting. If the report is deficient or remedial action is required to obtain compliance, this should be noted and the inspector notified. Once all reviewers have completed the report, they should initial it and a copy will be filed in the Mine Internal File.

### Assignments:

**Inspectors:** Review each cover sheet, AVS Legal/Financial, Mine Sequence Maps.  
**Hydrologists:** Review Water Monitoring Data, Precipitation and Climatological Data, Non-Coal Waste  
**Biologists:** Review Vegetation/Revegetation Success Monitoring, Raptor Survey  
**Engineers:** Review Subsidence Monitoring Data, Annual Impoundment Certification, Annual Overburden, Spoils, Refuse, Floor, etc.

SECTIONS TO REVIEW	SUBMITTED		FINDINGS
	YES	NO	
Cover Sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Covered sheet is filled out and appears to be complete.
AVS; Legal/ Financial Update	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The information is on file with DOGM however the there is an amendment requesting this information.
Mine Sequence Map	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Map is provided and P.E. certified.
Water Monitoring Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Information has been submitted in the Water Quality database.
Precipitation & Climatological Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presented in MRP
Non-Coal Waste report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-coal waste is hauled to the landfill.
Subsidence Monitoring Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Report is not P.E. certified.. No report of subsidence movement but mine has pulled pillars. Appear to be not normal. Sub 3 &4 are located in pillar area.
Annual Impoundment Certification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	P.E. certified, no hazardous conditions.
Annual Overburden, Spoil, Refuse, Floor, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Refuse Pile
Vegetation Data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not required or submitted as indicated in Annual Report 2002 cover sheet.
Revegetation Success Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not required or submitted as indicated in Annual Report 2002 cover sheet.

## 2002 Annual Report Review

SECTIONS TO REVIEW	SUBMITTED		FINDINGS
	YES	NO	
Raptor Survey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not required or submitted as indicated in Annual Report 2002 cover sheet.
Other Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Big game fatality report: Required and submitted as indicated in Annual Report 2002 cover sheet.</p> <p>The big game road kill fatality report indicates that employees killed no deer or elk during the year of 2002.</p> <p>Macroinvertebrate survey: Required and submitted as indicated in Annual Report 2002 cover sheet.</p> <p>The Permittee provided data and analyses for spring 2002 macroinvertebrate study conducted on the North fork of Gordon Creek. There was a misunderstanding of "treatment labeling" between BYU and JBR consultants. This misunderstanding makes it difficult to understand explanations of the results. The Permittee must provide the Division with authorization to discuss with JBR the 2002 results.</p> <p>The Permittee must work with JBR to insure the following items are addressed in subsequent macroinvertebrate reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clearly labeled tables and text for up- and downstream "treatments".</li> <li>2. Clearly labeled table columns.</li> <li>3. Correct totals for referenced data sets and columns.</li> </ol> <p>The misunderstanding of treatment labeling seems to be that BYU and JBR refer oppositely to the two sites. Therefore, it is not clear whether the health of the upper creek area is greater or lesser than the creek below the Gordon/Jewkes confluence. It is not clear whether "Stations 1 &amp; 2" on table column headings are referring to upper or lower creek (the "*Note" does not adequately clarify). The taxa total for Station 1 does not equal 16, but rather 17. It is unclear if the values for the column "Stations" in table 1 are counts, averages, or some other number. Units or explanations of columns are typical scientific methods of reporting numbers.</p>

O:\007020.HZN\FINAL\AR\_2002.doc