

Incoming
041002
R

From: "Hansen, Chris" <CHansen@archcoal.com>
To: April Abate <aprilabate@utah.gov>
Date: 6/11/2010 9:08 AM
Subject: RE: Question about piezometers at SUFCO North Water Spring Area

April:

Sorry to take so long to reply. The piezometers were put into place after mining had passed through the north water spring area and before the next panel to the east was mined. We were trying to determine the impacts to the alluvium has mining passed beneath the area. A report that contained the completion data for the piezometers as well as water level data was submitted to the Division sometime after the last panel was mined. Periodically we have submitted updated water levels to the Division and Forest. Dale Harber has asked for an update to his data file. Leland is sending him that data today.

As I recall there is no commitment to send this additional data to the division in our permit documents but we are happy to send that information on a periodic basis. We keep an eye on these sites to see what happens over time and as climatic conditions change. We also want to see what happens once surface water is returned to the area.

As for Pines 109 and 110, I'll have to check with Mike Davis on their status.

Sitting here listening to the SUWA folks entertain the DOGM Board on some surface water site testimony. Good times!

Chris

From: April Abate [aprilabate@utah.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 9:37 AM
To: Hansen, Chris
Subject: Question about piezometers at SUFCO North Water Spring Area

Hi Chris,

I was hoping you could answer some questions for me about some data that the Forest Service has been asking for. Since I have only recently been assigned to SUFCO, I am trying to get a better picture of some of the history behind the issue at North Water Springs. I understand that SUFCO installed a network of piezometers to monitor the groundwater levels. I believe DOGM was initially getting some of that data when the piezometers were first installed but we have not been getting that data in more recent years. Was there some type of agreement between DOGM and SUFCO to provide these data - (I couldn't locate any type of commitment in our annual report documents) from what I can tell, there is not. The Forest Service has been asking us for these data and I have not been able to provide it to them. Have they approached SUFCO about this recently? I noted there were two samples in our water monitoring database labeled USFS 109 and USFS 110 which are noted as voluntary and data is not reported to us. Are these somehow related? If you could help me to connect the dots a bit more on this issue, I would be grateful.....

Thanks so much Chris.

Regards,
April

April A. Abate
Environmental Scientist II
Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
1594 W. North Temple, Suite 1210
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801