

**OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING
RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT
FOR THE
REGULATORY PROGRAM
ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE OF**

ALASKA

**EVALUATION YEAR 2000
OCTOBER 1, 1999 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2000**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction
- II. Overview of Coal Mining Industry
- III. Overview of Public Participation in the Program
- IV. Major Accomplishments/Issues/Innovations
- V. Success in Achieving the Purposes of SMCRA
 - A. Off-site Impacts
 - B. Reclamation Success
 - C. Customer Service
- VI. OSM Assistance
- VII. General Oversight Topic Reviews
- Appendix A: Tabular Summary of Core Data to Characterize the Program
- Appendix B: State Comments on the Report.

Introduction

The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) created the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) in the Department of the Interior. SMCRA provides authority to OSM to oversee the implementation of and provide Federal funding for State regulatory programs that have been approved by OSM as meeting the minimum standards specified by SMCRA. This report contains summary information regarding the Alaska program and the effectiveness of the Alaska program in meeting the applicable purposes of SMCRA as specified in Section 102. This report covers the period of October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000. Detailed background information and comprehensive reports from the program elements evaluated during the period are available for review and copying at the Olympia, Washington OSM Office.

The following list of acronyms are used in this report:

AML	Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation
AVS	Applicant Violator System
DMLW	Division of Mining, Land and Water
DNR	Alaska Department of Natural Resources
EY	Evaluation Year
GRP	Gold Run Pass Mine
GVEA	Golden Valley Electric Association
NOV	Notice of Violation
OSM	Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
PFM	Poker Flats Mine
PITS	Permit Information Tracking System
SMCRA	Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977

TBR	Two Bull Ridge Mine
TDN	Ten-day Notice
TIPS	Technical Information Processing System
UCM	Usibelli Coal Mine, Inc.
WRCC	Western Region Coordinating Center

II. Overview of the Alaska Coal Mining Industry

Alaska is home to enormous known coal reserves, estimated to be approximately 170 billion tons; however, presently, coal mining does not contribute significantly to the overall economy of the State. Most of the economic benefits from the coal industry are realized at the local level. Healy, Alaska is presently the site of the only active coal mining in the State. Despite of the fact that the Healy area economy is becoming more diversified due to increasing tourism, the area benefits greatly from the economic contributions made possible by coal mining.

The three active surface mines, which encompass six separate permits, are located in the Hoseanna Creek Valley, near Healy, and employ about 150 individuals and the adjacent Golden Valley Electric Association (GVEA) mine mouth power plant employs about another 40 to 50 individuals. Much of the coal mined in the Hoseanna Creek Valley is utilized by the GVEA plant; however, some coal is transported by rail and truck to other facilities in Fairbanks and to military installations throughout the State. The operator of the Hoseanna Creek Valley mines, Usibelli Coal Mine Inc. (UCM) also exports a significant portion of the coal to South Korea.

Not only is UCM the largest year-round employer in the Healy area, the company is very active in the community, supporting many local activities. Baring any unforeseen circumstances, there is good likelihood that production, and possibly employment opportunities may increase in the area because UCM is now producing coal at its Two Bull Ridge Mine (TBR) which is across Hoseana Creek from the Poker Flats Mine (PFM). The mine, permitted in late 1997, has been in a start-up mode the last 2 years. UCM officials project approximately 2.1 million tons of coal being mined annually at TBR once the mine is at full production.

Within the last two years, UCM has assumed, through permit transfer, the lease/mining rights to two additional Division of Mining, Land and Water (DMLW) permits as well as

an exploration permit. UMC plans to develop this area when the coal market improves. The permits are located in an area known as Wishbone Hill, about 1 hour northeast of Anchorage, near the town of Sutton. Considering that transportation concerns and costs often make Alaska coal economically unfeasible, the location of UCM's Wishbone Hill permits might trigger increased activity in Alaska coal, especially for export markets.

Although no coal removal has occurred at the Sutton location, the permit transfers could be a positive indication that UCM is not only committed to coal removal in the Hoseanna Creek Valley, but statewide as well.

At the close of the 1999 evaluation year, the operator of a struggling underground coal mine, the Jonesville Mine, also located in the Sutton area, was in the process of selling all assets to an oil and gas company. The potential mine purchaser contacted the DMLW concerning permit transfer procedures. Since the last evaluation cycle, it appears the present owner has decided to retain both the coal leases and the permit. DMLW has been working closely with the permittee to address some nagging issues.

III Overview of the Public Participation Opportunities in the Oversight Process and the State Program

Historically, there has been little public interest in the Alaska coal program; this has been due both to the small scale of the Alaska coal industry and the remote location of the active mining operations. Until recently, there has been little interest on the part of the coal industry to expand existing mine operations or to pursue development of new sites; and, as a result, public interest in coal related activities has been minimal.

The management of DMLW, in conjunction with OSM, has provided several opportunities during the past several years for public involvement in not only permitting activities/decisions but overall SMCRA program maintenance and administration. DMLW and/or OSM published public notices in the State's two largest newspapers located in Fairbanks and Anchorage, announcing DMLW decisions or public meetings at which input could be provided to State and Federal officials. Additionally, in 1997, the State mailed approximately 150 public outreach letters soliciting input concerning the administration of the coal program. Both of these approaches failed to generate any public involvement.

In the past, DMLW officials believed a more targeted approach was needed due to the size and remoteness of Alaska. DMLW contacted the Alaska Center for the Environment and asked if a representative would be interested in serving as part of a multi-interest discussion group including representatives from OSM, DMLW and the Alaska Coal Association. Although the Alaska Center for the Environment never formally accepted

the State's proposal, the other parties have met several times to discuss program related issues.

With the increased interest in the coal resources in the Sutton area and with a greater potential for impacts to the public, the DMLW felt a different approach to public involvement was needed. As previously reported, Sutton is located approximately one hour northeast of Anchorage and has a much greater population density than most of Alaska. To notify the local citizenry of coal related activities, DMLW published the usual newspaper notices as well as posted information flyers throughout the Sutton area. The staff of DMLW has continued to keep the Sutton Community Council, the Buffalo Mine Road Community Council and the Chickaloon native community informed of the coal related activities in the area by attending Council meetings and arranging site visits for those citizens interested in doing so. DMLW has encouraged representatives of UCM to attend Community Council meetings to make presentations and to answer citizens questions concerning any pending activities. DMLW management has realized the benefits of involving the local citizens as early as possible in the decision making process.

It should be noted that public participation is increasing in the Sutton area. During the last evaluation year, a public notice generated 19 significant public comments that were addressed by the DMLW. Another factor that has triggered public involvement is the DMLW's increased use of the internet to advertise permitting actions, make available permit related documents and to solicit public input.

As previously reported, the Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR), has published a detailed and informative publication entitled, Mining Reclamation in Alaska Just Doing It Right. The 37 page publication focuses on reclamation requirements and practices employed by both the coal industry and the hard-rock mining industry. A chapter is dedicated to the State's Abandoned Mined Lands Reclamation program (AML). Lastly, the publication recognizes the past recipients of the Alaskan Reclamation Award. This publication was widely distributed to interested parties as well as being available for general distribution to the public. Having been available for a few years, DMLW still gets requests for the publication; however, it doesn't seem that the publication has resulted in any marked increased in public participation. More recently, DMLW has put the 10 volume Wishbone Hill Mine permit on CD and has placed a copy in both the Sutton and Palmer public libraries.

IV Major Accomplishments/ Issues/ Innovations in the Alaska Program

For the first time in several years, DMLW is fully staffed. A mining engineer was added to the staff during the evaluation cycle. He is involved in permitting activities and mine site inspections.

As discussed in previous oversight reports, the DMLW signed off on the constructed buttress and grading work performed at UCM s Poker Flats Mine. The work was required to abate a long standing Notice of Violation (NOV) issued to UCM for unstable out slopes. During the joint OSM/DMLW mine site inspection, the vegetation on the out slope was evaluated and found to be quite successful. There are some areas that OSM and DMLW are monitoring in conjunction with the operator, so as to prevent erosion rills and gullies from becoming too established. It should be noted that DMLW and UCM have mutually agreed to an extended ten-year monitoring period to ensure long-term success of the abatement work.

As discussed in last years evaluation report, the State was making progress in developing a data management system. After some initial testing of the Coal Permit Information Tracking System (PITS), the DMLW made some major modifications. Due to some staffing and organizational changes, the time frame for completing the revisions to Coal PITS was changed. OSM reviewed the State s progress on developing Coal PITS-2 as part of this evaluation cycle.

During the 1999 evaluation year, DMLW made available, via the internet, the coal program regulations. During this evaluation cycle, DMLW posted all of the active mining permits on the internet. For those interested, the internet address is:

www.dnr.state.ak.us/mine.wat/coal/coal.htm

In late 1999, Alaska received its first permit related application electronically. UCM submitted a major revision to its Two Bull Ridge permit via the internet. Then DMLW initiated the 30 day public/agency comment period by posting its public notice on the internet. The notice instructed interested parties how to download the TBR permit revision application and how to submit review comments electronically.

During the evaluation year, the Acting Director of OSM was able to visit the State of Alaska. She visited several mine sites, toured active AML reclamation project sites and met with Federal, State and industry representatives active in the Alaska coal scene.

The DMLW is effectively administering the Alaska Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Act. There continues to be an open and cooperative relationship between OSM and DMLW.

V Success in Achieving the Purposes of SMCRA as Determined by Measuring and Reporting End Results

To further the concept of reporting end results, the findings from performance standard

and public participation evaluations are being collected for a national perspective in terms of the number and extent of observed off-site impacts, the number of acres that have been mined and reclaimed and which meet the bond release requirements for the various phases of reclamation, and the effectiveness of customer service provided by the State. Individual topic findings are available in the Olympia, Washington Office. The information provides additional details on how the following evaluations and measurements were conducted.

A. Off-Site Impacts

On September 19 through 21, 2000, the Reclamation Specialist from the OSM Olympia, Washington Office conducted inspections at three active mines located in the Hoseanna Creek Valley. The OSM inspector was accompanied by the DMLW Chief of the coal regulatory program, 2 DMLW mine inspectors and representatives from the coal company. The focus of the inspections was drainage control systems, erosion control measures, reclamation success and construction of a valley fill. OSM receives each DMLW inspection report electronically. This allows OSM to monitor routinely the on-the-ground issues at each mine. Also, the State and OSM routinely discuss different situations at the mines based on the information contained in the inspection reports. As previously stated, mining in the Hoseanna Creek Valley occurs in a rather sparsely populated area, and as such, there is no record of public concern over the mining activity being conducted there. One issue, drainage from the partially constructed valley fill at the Two Bull Ridge mine, was cited by OSM in a Ten-Day Notice (TDN). The State's response provided sufficient information and justification to demonstrate that no violation existed at the time of the OSM inspection. See the Mine-Site Evaluation Inspection Reports (MEIR) and the DMLW inspection reports on file at OSM's Olympia Office or at DMLW's Anchorage office for more details.

All blasting records for the period of August 30th through September 8th were reviewed and found to be in order. Based upon the above information and documents reviewed, OSM found that the three active operations evaluated were free from any off-site impacts.

B. Reclamation Success

As Table 5 shows, the State did not receive nor process any Phase I, Phase II or Phase III bond release applications during the evaluation period.

C. Customer Service

The DMLW has actively sought to increase public awareness and involvement. Not until UCM's recent leasing/permitting activities in the more populated Sutton

area, has the public shown much interest in coal related issues. DMLW meets regularly with the Sutton Community Council, the Buffalo Creek Road Community Council and the Chickaloon native community and, when appropriate, so do staff from UCM. The DMLW staff, on numerous occasions, have conducted site visits with interested citizens living in the Sutton area. The staff at DMLW does not anticipate much in the way of public participation or input until active mining commences in the Sutton area. There were no citizens complaints filed with DMLW during this evaluation cycle.

VI OSM Assistance

The level of assistance provided to Alaska during this evaluation period remained fairly consistent with previous years. As in previous years, staff from OSM's Technical Information Processing System (TIPS) provided both technical support for Alaska's TIPS system and on-site training relative to TIPS specific software. Also, DMLW staff attended training provided by the Western Region Coordinating Center's (WRCC) Office of Technology Transfer (OTT) and OSM's National Technical Training Program. Additionally, the State has received OTT funding to further its electronic permitting efforts.

In response to a U.S. District Court decision, OSM focused some attention towards written permit findings and their adequacy. As part of this initiative, WRCC, in conjunction with the Western Interstate Energy Board, held a conference in Denver in November 1999 to share ideas about required permit findings. Staff from DMLW participated in the conference.

During the evaluation period, planning and scheduling was concluded for two OSM training courses that are to be offered during the 2001 evaluation cycle. WRCC's insurance and bonding specialist taught a bonding course to DNR employees in Anchorage in early December. To make the training cost effective, staff from other Divisions within DNR were invited to attend.

An effective writing course is scheduled to be taught in Evaluation Year 2001 to DMLW staff and other interested DNR employees.

Also, during the evaluation period, routine assistance was provided to DMLW in the areas of permitting, inspection and enforcement, forms development, program maintenance and data management.

OSM's Olympia Office has an excellent relationship with the DMLW staff, and as such many informal conversations occur in which various issues are discussed. Often

suggestions are offered and ideas are exchanged that don't necessarily constitute formal assistance; but, as long as both parties are comfortable with such an arrangement, it will continue.

VII General Oversight Topic Reviews

As in previous evaluation cycles, OSM and DMLW have chosen to keep the program oversight process both simple and flexible, focusing on a few key program areas and being able to adjust oversight objectives if necessary. This approach is both possible and desirable due to the smallness of the Alaska program and the coal industry currently operating in the State. The openness and solid lines of communication between the DMLW staff and the OSM Olympia staff contributes greatly to the success of this approach. There is a small core Alaska oversight team in place with all other oversight activities being conducted by Ad Hoc team members that change according to the selected review topics.

As discussed in the Annual Evaluation Plan, OSM and DMLW identified some specific program areas that both agencies believed warranted evaluation. The program areas identified are:

- " DMLW's preparation of written permit findings
- " DMLW's refinement of the Coal Permit Information Tracking System
- " DMLW's administration of the Nerox Power System permit
- " DMLW's maintenance of its approved program

Additionally, OSM reviewed several other general program areas and gathered some routine data as agreed upon in the Annual Evaluation Plan.

Summary of Topic Reviews

*** □ DMLW s Preparation of Written Permit Findings**

Permit Transfer

As previously mentioned in Section VI, OSM, in response to a U.S. District Court decision, has selected written permit findings as a topic for review during this evaluation cycle. Accordingly, the oversight evaluation team selected two permit findings documents for review. The first are permit findings associated with the transfer of 2 mining permits from North Pacific Mining, Inc. to Usibelli Coal Mine Inc.

DMLW received the request to transfer the inactive permits in the Summer of 1997. Although initially issued in 1989, no mining activity has occurred at the permitted site. Usibelli Coal Mine Inc. requested that the permits, as originally approved, be transferred with no changes. After conducting a review, DMLW approved the permit transfers and issued a Findings of Fact and Decision

OSM staff discussed the transfer process with the DMLW permitting staff and reviewed the December 1, 1997 findings document. The State, based upon OSM s findings, properly processed the transfer application, conducted the required Applicant Violator System (AVS) checks, published the required public notification, took receipt of the replacement bond and made the appropriate written findings in accordance with the Alaska statute and regulations. DMLW also notified the new permittee, that due to the lack of mining activity at this site, the transferred permits would not be renewed beyond the current expiration date of September 4, 2001, without a complete technical reevaluation.

Major Permit Revision Findings

The second permit findings document selected for review is for a major permit revision to the Usibelli Coal Mine Inc. s Two Bull Ridge (TBR) permit. The State approved in November 1999, a permit revision request for a 9.5 million cubic yard valley fill at TBR. The revision request was being processed shortly after the controversial decision rendered by U.S. District Court Judge Hayden on March

3,1999 concerning the issue of valley fill operations in the State of West Virginia. A copy of Judge Hayden s decision was provided to the State with the understanding that even though the decision did not directly impact Alaska s program, it would probably result in attention being focused on valley fill operations nationwide. The DMLW staff, not having prior experience with valley fill operation applications, coupled with the intense national attention, were very deliberate in their processing of the UCM revision request.

The DMLW staff had several telephone conversations with staff from OSM concerning both administrative and technical issues associated with the revision package. DMLW was also working closely with staff from other Federal agencies and staff from other Divisions within DNR.

OSM staff had few concerns relative to the processing of the revision application. However, due to the nature of the revision request, coupled with OSM s national focus on written permit findings, the oversight team decided to evaluate DMLW s written findings, essentially killing two birds with one stone.

The Chief of the Surface Coal Regulatory Program signed the Decision and Findings of Compliance Document on November 30, 1999, granting approval of UCM s permit revision request. The 42 page document contains 5 pages of permit related text addressing required permit conditions, general permit stipulations, specific permit stipulations and the permit decision itself. What is most impressive are the remaining 37 pages that constitute the Findings of Compliance portion of the document.

The document indicates that DMLW directly solicited comments from 19 different entities as diverse as Federal, State and Borough agencies to the Alaska Miners Association to the Northern Alaska Environmental Center. DMLW also made the revision application available for downloading from the World Wide Web. The Findings of Compliance portion is very complete and detailed, addressing those requirements found at Section 27.21 of the Alaska Statute and Section 11 AAC 90 of the regulations. It is evident that DMLW not only conducted a comprehensive technical review of the permit revision application but also complied thoroughly with all administrative and public notification requirements as well. The Decision and Findings document is extremely well written document. A copy of the document is available for viewing at OSM s Olympia, Washington office as well DMLW s office in Anchorage.

* □ **DMLW s Refinement of the Coal Permit Information Tracking System (COAL-PITS)**

This topic is a follow-up topic from the 1999 evaluation cycle. DMLW initiated work on a data base management system in 1998 with a goal of completing the system during the 1999 evaluation period. However, due to restructuring of the Division of Mines and personnel actions, the State postponed modifying the data management system until the Winter of 2000. Accordingly, the oversight team rescheduled its review until this evaluation period.

As previously mentioned in Section IV, some problems were identified in the State s initial version of its data management system. The DMLW s operating system is Windows based and OSM uses Windows NT and as a result OSM experienced some data access and retrieval problems. Some other problems triggered by system incompatibility were identified during the early stages of use. Both OSM and DMLW documented the encountered problems and the DMLW staff initiated a major revision effort. A DMLW staff member visited the OSM Olympia, Washington office to demonstrate the modified program and to work with the OSM staff. He also identified some areas of possible future revision and /or improvement.

The revised system, COAL-PITS2, allows the user to access most mine related information such as:

- permit acreage
- disturbed acreage
- reclamation status
- bonding and bond release status
- copies of inspection reports
- enforcement actions

digital photo archive

links to other related information

This second generation data management system is greatly improved over the initial version and is much more user friendly. As with most systems of this type, there will be further change with additional usage. The State plans to improve COAL-PITS2 over time by adding additional mine related information generated by other Divisions within DNR

* □ **DMLW s Administration of Nerox Power Systems Inc. Jonesville _____
Underground Mine Permit**

This is an on-going review from the 1999 EY. In order to aid the reader, the summary from last year s evaluation report is included in italicized font.

Nerox Power Systems (Nerox) holds the permit for the Jonesville underground mine located in the Sutton area, which is approximately 1 hour from Anchorage. Nerox permitted the previously disturbed and abandoned site with the intention of taking advantage of the close proximity to Anchorage and the existing transportation infrastructure. After some initial investment and operational improvements, Nerox encountered financial setbacks and, coupled with the downturn in the coal market, never mined an ounce of coal.

DMLW, not wanting to forfeit the bond, attempted to work with the permittee to ensure environmental controls were in place and that no off-site impacts occurred while Nerox attempted to find a buyer for the mine. DMLW, with OSM concurrence, believed that this was the best approach, in light of the fact that several other companies were expressing interest in the Jonesville site.

At the end of the evaluation year, DMLW was in the process of reviewing a permit transfer application. Identified deficiencies were addressed and all outstanding NOV s and Reclamation Directives were abated while at the same time, the company has assigned an employee on-the-ground compliance responsibilities during the permit transfer process. DMLW keeps OSM apprized of the status of the permit transfer.

The anticipated permit transfer discussed above did not materialize due to lease related problems. Nerox Power Systems Inc. remains the permittee. DMLW was planning on combining the permit transfer effort last year with a permit renewal effort so as to update and clean up the current permit. Since the transfer did not

occur, DMLW is concentrating on the permit renewal effort. The State strongly encouraged Nerox to assign an individual to work with DMLW on the permit renewal effort; Nerox has done so. The same individual has also been given the responsibility to work with DMLW staff relative to all on-the-ground issues.

During the EY, Nerox lost a court case and was ordered to pay a sizeable sum of money to three of its contractors for work done in connection with the mine. Nerox is appealing the decision; however, should it loose on appeal, the DMLW staff are concerned that the settlement amount of approximately \$300,000 will force the company to file for bankruptcy. The State continues to work closely with the permittee to ensure compliance with environmental requirements while at the same time not taking any action that might force the permittee to forfeit his reclamation bond. The State continues to get enough positive response from the permittee that it is unwilling to initiate forfeiture proceedings; however, the Chief of the Coal Regulatory Program has stated to OSM staff that he is prepared to do so if it appears that the State s interests are about to be jeopardized. He has kept OSM staff informed during the entire process.

To date, OSM has agreed with the State s approach. Having said that, OSM cautions DMLW not to allow the current situation at the Jonesville Mine to continue much longer. It is safe to say that both OSM and DMLW are interested in bringing closure to this issue.

* □ **Maintenance of Approved Program**

This is an ongoing area of review. Not much was accomplished last year relative to program maintenance. This was the case with many States. In an attempt to address this issue, OSM s Acting Director and the Management Council has made program maintenance a priority for this EY. Prior to the Management Council s action, OSM staff and DMLW staff met to discuss needed revisions to the State program and tentative time frames. Even though it was after the close of the 2000 evaluation cycle, OSM prepared and forwarded to DMLW a complete list of needed revisions to the Alaska program. The State has committed to working with OSM in addressing this nagging problem that has been avoided for too long.

For more information on these oversight topics, or any other aspect of the 2000 annual oversight process, feel free to contact:

Office of Surface Mining

Evergreen Plaza Building, Suite 703

711 Capitol Way

Olympia, Washington 98501

(360) 753-9538

Attention: Glenn Waugh

E mail: gwaugh@wscgw.osmre.gov

APPENDIX A:

These tables present data pertinent to mining operations and State and Federal regulatory activities within Alaska. They also summarize funding provided by OSM as well as Alaska staffing. Unless otherwise specified, the reporting period for the data contained in all tables is October 1, 1999 to September 30, 2000. Additional data used by OSM in its evaluation of Alaska's performance is available for review in the evaluation files maintained by the Olympia, Washington OSM Office.

TABLE 1

COAL PRODUCTION (Millions of short tons)			
Period	Surface mines	Underground mines	Total
Coal production ^A for entire State:			
Annual Period			
1997	1.42	0	1.42
1998	1.44	0	1.44
1999	1.58	0	1.58
	4.44	0	4.44

^A Coal production as reported in this table is the gross tonnage which includes coal that is sold, used or transferred as reported to OSM by each mining company on form OSM-1 line 8(a). Gross tonnage does not provide for a moisture reduction. OSM verifies tonnage reported through routine auditing of mining companies. This production may vary from that reported by States or other sources due to varying methods of determining and reporting coal production.

TABLE 2

INSPECTABLE UNITS													
As of September 30, 2000													
Coal mines and related facilities	Number and status of permits								Insp. Unit^D	Permitted acreage^A (hundreds of acres)			
	Active or temporarily inactive		Inactive		Abandoned		Totals						
	IP	PP	Phase II bond release										
			IP	PP	IP	PP	IP	PP		IP	PP	Total	
STATE and PRIVATE LANDS REGULATORY AUTHORITY: STATE													
Surface mines	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	12.75	12.75	
Underground mines	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.25	0.25	
Other facilities	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
Subtotals	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	13	13	
FEDERAL LANDS REGULATORY AUTHORITY: STATE													
Surface mines	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Underground mines	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Other facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Subtotals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ALL LANDS^B													
Surface mines	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	12.75	12.75	
Underground mines	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.25	0.25	
Other facilities	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
Totals	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	13	13	
Average number of permits per inspectable unit (excluding exploration sites)											<u>1</u>		
Average number of acres per inspectable unit (excluding exploration sites)											<u>843.3843.3</u>		
Number of exploration permits on State and private lands:											<u>9</u>	On Federal lands: <u>0</u> ^C	
Number of exploration notices on State and private lands:											<u>1</u>	On Federal lands: <u>0</u> ^C	
<p>IP : Initial regulatory program sites.</p> <p>PP : Permanent regulatory program sites.</p> <p>^A When a unit is located on more than one type of land, includes only the acreage located on the indicated type of land.</p> <p>^B Numbers of units may not equal the sum of the three preceding categories because a single inspectable unit may include lands in more than one of the preceding categories.</p> <p>^C Includes only exploration activities regulated by the State pursuant to a cooperative agreement with OSM or by OSM pursuant to a Federal lands program. Excludes exploration regulated by the Bureau of Land Management.</p> <p>^D Inspectable Units includes multiple permits that have been grouped together as one unit for inspection frequency purposes by some State programs.</p>													

TABLE 3

**STATE PERMITTING ACTIVITY
As of September 30, 2000**

Type of application	Surface mines			Underground mines			Other facilities			Totals		
	App. Rec.	Issued	Acres	App. Rec.	Issued	Acres ^A	App. Rec.	Issued	Acres	App. Rec.	Issued	Acres
New permits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Renewals	1	1	519	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	519
Transfers, sales and assignments of permit rights	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Small operator assistance	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Exploration permits	2	2		0	0		0	0		2	2	
Exploration notices ^B		0			0			0			0	
Revisions (exclusive of incidental boundary revisions)		1			0			0			1	
Incidental boundary revisions		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
Totals	3	4	519	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	519

OPTIONAL - Number of midterm permit reviews completed that are not reported as revisions 1

^A Includes only the number of acres of proposed surface disturbance.

^B State approval not required. Involves removal of less than 250 tons of coal and does not affect lands designated unsuitable for mining.

TABLE 4

OFF-SITE IMPACTS														
DEGREE OF IMPACT		RESOURCES AFFECTED												Total
		People			Land			Water			Structures			
		minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	
TYPE OF IMPACT	Blasting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Land Stability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hydrology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Encroachment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of inspectable units: <u> 10 </u>														
Inspectable units free of off-site impacts: <u> 10 </u>														
OFF-SITE IMPACTS ON BOND FORFEITURE SITES														
DEGREE OF IMPACT		RESOURCES AFFECTED												Total
		People			Land			Water			Structures			
		minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	
TYPE OF IMPACT	Blasting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Land Stability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hydrology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Encroachment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of inspectable units: <u> 0 </u>														
Inspectable units free of off-site impacts: <u> 0 </u>														

Refer to the report narrative for complete explanation and evaluation of the information provided by this table.

TABLE 5

ANNUAL STATE MINING AND RECLAMATION RESULTS		
Bond release phase	Applicable performance standard	Acreage released during this evaluation period
Phase I	* <input type="checkbox"/> Approximate original contour restored * <input type="checkbox"/> Topsoil or approved alternative replaced	0
Phase II	* <input type="checkbox"/> Surface stability * <input type="checkbox"/> Establishment of vegetation	0
Phase III	* <input type="checkbox"/> Post-mining land use/productivity restored * <input type="checkbox"/> Successful permanent vegetation * <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater recharge, quality and quantity restored * <input type="checkbox"/> Surface water quality and quantity restored	0
	Bonded Acreage Status^A	Acres
	Total number of bonded acres at end of last review period (September 30, 1999) ^B	1,189
	Total number of bonded acres during this evaluation year	1,189
	Number of acres bonded during this evaluation year that are considered remaining, if available	0
	Number of acres where bond was forfeited during this evaluation year (also report this acreage on Table 7)	0
^A Bonded acreage is considered to approximate and represent the number of acres disturbed by surface coal mining and reclamation operations. ^B Bonded acres in this category are those that have not received a Phase III or other final bond release (State maintains jurisdiction).		

OPTIONAL TABLES 6

(See Instructions)

TABLE 7

STATE BOND FORFEITURE ACTIVITY

(Permanent Program Permits)

	Number of Sites	Dollars	Disturbed Acres
Bonds forfeited as of September 30, 1999 ^A	0	0	0
Bonds forfeited during EY 2000	0	0	0
Forfeited bonds collected as September 30, 1999 ^A	0	0	0
Forfeited bonds collected during EY 2000	0	0	0
Forfeiture sites reclaimed during EY 2000	0	0 ^B	0
Forfeiture sites repermited during EY 2000	0		0
Forfeiture sites unreclaimed as of September 30, 2000	0		0
Excess reclamation costs recovered from permittee	0	0	
Excess forfeiture proceeds returned to permittee	0	0	
^A Includes data only for those forfeiture sites not fully reclaimed as of this date. ^B Cost of reclamation, excluding general administrative expenses.			

TABLE 8

STATE STAFFING (Full-time equivalents at end of evaluation year)	
Function	EY 2000
Regulatory Program	
Permit review	1.25
Inspection	1.53
Other (administrative, fiscal, personnel, etc.)	1.02
SUB-TOTAL	3.80
AML Program	5.00
TOTAL	8.80

TABLE 9

FUNDS GRANTED TO [STATE] BY OSM (Millions of dollars) EY 2000		
Type of Grant	Federal Funds Awarded	Federal Funding as a Percentage of Total Program Costs
Administration and enforcement	0.17	50%
Small operator assistance	0	0
Totals	0.17	

APPENDIX B: