## **Office of Surface Mining**

Grants and Oversight Team
Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center
Annual Evaluation Summary Report

for the

Administered by the Division of Soil Conservation

of

## **IOWA**

for

**Evaluation Year 2001** 

October 1, 2000, to September 30, 2001

November 2001

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

During the 2001 Evaluation Year (EY), the Office of Surface Mining (OSM), Grants and Oversight Team (GOT) conducted oversight evaluations of the Iowa Department of Agriculture & Land Stewardship, Division of Soil Conservation (IDSC) Regulatory and Abandoned Mine Land (AML) programs. The oversight studies focused on the success of the IDSC in meeting the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) goals for environmental protection and prompt, effective reclamation of land mined for coal. A Partnership Plan in the form of a Performance Agreement (PA) was cooperatively developed by GOT and IDSC to tailor the oversight activities to the unique conditions of the State program. The purpose for the oversight activities was to identity the need for and then provide financial, technical, and other program assistance to strengthen the State program.

Studies in the areas of offsite impacts, reclamation success, and customer service were conducted by GOT in support of OSM=s national initiatives. These include the following studies.

- **SOFF-SITE IMPACTS (ACTIVE OR NON-FORFEITED)** The number of off-site impacts was reduced from 12 to 11 during EY 2001. This slight reduction was attributed to surety companies completing reclamation in lieu of bond forfeiture. Other off-site impacts will be eliminated in EY 2002 as the surety companies and State reclamation accelerates.
- **SOFF-SITE IMPACTS (BOND FORFEITURE)** Of the five forfeited sites, there were three off-site impacts noted on three sites. These off-site impacts were also identified in EY 2000. Forty percent of the sites were free from off-site impacts. Preliminary reclamation plans have been completed on the three inspectable units with off-site impacts. Reclamation was initiated in the summer of 2001, thus potentially eliminating the off-site impacts in the coming year.
- \$ END RESULTS (RECLAMATION SUCCESS) The State received two bond release applications during the later part of EY 2001. These applications are in the process of being reviewed with bond releases anticipated by mid EY 2002.

The State continues to pursue reclamation through the bond forfeiture process. During the evaluation year, five mine sites that had been reclaimed with bond forfeiture funds received liability releases and were removed from the list of inspectable units. Reclamation work continued on two mine sites. Reclamation bonds were forfeited and collected for five mine sites.

The State, with OSM assistance, is in the process of initiating preliminary design on a bond forfeiture project. Initial designs were completed on two additional forfeiture sites, and plans were developed for two other forfeiture sites.

One site is being reclaimed by the Surety Company. It is anticipated that during EY 2002, the company will submit a bond release application to the State. This application will be processed

through the formal bond release process. Sureties are subject to responsibility periods if bond is not forfeited.

\$ CUSTOMER SERVICE – BOND RELEASE - Since the two bond release applications received during the evaluation period were not completed during EY 2001, the effectiveness of IDSC=s customer service in relation to bond releases can not be evaluated. Field reviews and eventual Phase I release of some areas will be completed by mid EY 2002.

The following general oversight topic reviews were completed.

- **\$ AML ON-THE-GROUND RECLAMATION** The Iowa AML program is managed in a cost effective and professional manner. All projects are in compliance with appropriate laws and regulation. Designs are well thought out, reasonable, cost effective, and use the best technology currently available. Completed projects have resulted in elimination of extreme hazards to the public and restoration of beneficial land uses. Moreover, they are completed with minimal disturbance to the environment.
- **\$ AML CUSTOMER SERVICE (PUBLIC OUTREACH) -** Iowa has a computer based public inquiry tracking system. All public inquiries are entered and maintained in the system. The State program continues to effectively provide for customer service and public outreach in an excellent manner.

## **Table of Contents**

	Executi	ive Summary	1
I.	Introdu	action	.1
II.	Overvi	ew of the Iowa Coal Mining Industry	.2
III.	Overvi	ew of Public Participation in the Program	.2
IV.	Major .	Accomplishments/Issues/Innovations	.2
V. of 19		s in Achieving the Purposes of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act	.4
	A.	Off-site Impacts	.5
	B.	Reclamation Success	.5
	C.	Customer Service.	.6
	D.	Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation.	.7
VI.	OSM A	Assistance	.8
VII.	Genera	l Oversight Topic Reviews	.8
	A.	AML On-The-Ground Reclamation	.8
	B.	AML Customer Service (Public Outreach)	.9
Append		Tabular Summaries of Data Pertaining to Mining, Reclamation and Program administration	
Append	dix B: S	State Comments on Report	

### 2001 IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

#### I. Introduction

The SMCRA created the OSM in the Department of the Interior. SMCRA provides authority to OSM to oversee the regulation 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 IDSC and the effectiveness of the Iowa program in meeting the applicable purposes of SMCRA as specified in Section 102. This report covers the period of October 1, 2000, to September 30, 2001.

The primary focus of the OSM oversight policy for EY 2001 is an on-the-ground results-oriented strategy that evaluates the end result of State programs in ensuring that areas on the mine site are protected from impacts during mining and that areas on the mine site are contemporaneously and successfully reclaimed after mining activities are completed. The policy emphasizes a shared commitment between OSM and the State to ensure the success of SMCRA through the development and implementation of a performance agreement. Also, the policy encourages public participation as part of the oversight strategy. Besides the primary focus of evaluating end results, the oversight guidance makes clear OSM=s responsibility to conduct inspections to monitor the State=s effectiveness in ensuring compliance with SMCRA=s environmental protection.

To further the idea that oversight is a continuous and ongoing process, this annual report is structured to report on the progress of OSM and Iowa in conducting evaluations and completing oversight activities and on their accomplishments at the end of the evaluation period. Detailed background information and comprehensive reports for the program elements evaluated during the period are available for review and copying at OSM=s Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center (MCRCC) at 501 Belle Street, Alton, Illinois, 62002.

The following list of acronyms are used in this report:

ACSI Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative

AML Abandoned Mine Land

AMLIS Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System

EY Evaluation Year

GOT Grants and Oversight Team

IDSC Iowa Division of Soil Conservation

MCRCC Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act

OSM Office of Surface Mining

SMCRA Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977

TIPS Technical Information Processing System

### II. Overview of the Iowa Coal Mining Industry

Iowa=s coal ranges from sub-bituminous to high-volatile C bituminous. The demonstrated coal reserve base in Iowa is estimated to be 2.2 billion tons, or less than one-half of one percent of the United States' coal reserves. Coal-bearing areas cover about 18,468 square miles, or 33 percent of the State. Most coal seams in Iowa are less than five feet thick and have a relatively high sulfur content.

Coal mining activities first began in Iowa in the 1840's. More than 35 companies extracted coal in 17 counties. A partial list of the counties where historical production occurred includes Polk, Story, Wapello, Van Buren, Keokuk, Davis, and Appanoose counties. Mining under SMCRA was concentrated in the four counties of Lucas, Marion, Mahaska, and Monroe. Annual production varied throughout Iowa=s mining history, peaking in 1981 at 708,602 tons. Production subsequently declined until it ceased in 1994 with 500,000 tons mined during that year. Most of this production came from surface mining operations. Fifty people were employed in the industry at that time. Thin coal seams and high sulphur content of the coal both contributed to the demise of coal mining in the State.

During the 2001 evaluation period, Iowa had 24 inspectable units. Twenty of these units were surface mines, two were underground mines, and two were wash plants (Table 2). The average number of acres per inspectable unit was 288. None of these inspectable units produced coal in EY 2001.

Before the enactment of SMCRA, approximately 13,764 acres were affected by coal mining in 17 Iowa counties. The current listing of hazardous conditions recorded in OSM=s Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS) includes the following: 104,314 feet of dangerous highwalls; 1,394 acres of dangerous spoil piles and embankments; 47 hazardous water bodies; 20 vertical openings; 19.3 miles of sediment clogged streams; 2,085 acres of mine lands which cause flooding and sediment deposition on unmined land.

### III. Overview of Public Participation in the Program

Public (citizen) requests for information, assistance, and investigations in Title IV and Title V receive prompt consideration and response. Iowa also coordinates with the appropriate State and Federal agencies in the development and implementation of reclamation projects. Copies of the ACitizens Complaint Card@are available to the public on request. This card provides a step-by-step process for citizens that wish to report a problem with coal mining under the Title IV and Title V reclamation programs.

In EY 2001, Iowa conducted several formal meetings with AML project landowners to review the design development on their projects. These formal meetings included one Preliminary Design Landowner Meeting, six Construction Easement Landowner Meetings, and two Final Design Landowner meetings.

#### IV. Major Accomplishments/Issues/Innovations

#### **Abandoned Mine Land Program**

The Iowa AML program is an active participant in OSM=s Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative (ACSI) program. Iowa has received a total of \$525,823 in ACSI funds, of which \$173,253 was awarded by OSM this year. The money is being used to reclaim a large abandoned mine site that is contributing acid mine drainage and sediment to Roberts Creek Lake. Reclamation work at the site will continue for several years. This year, the State commenced reclamation under Contract Number 3. Iowa anticipates future ACSI funds will be used to complete two additional contracts at the site.

In a letter dated September 26, 1994, the OSM Director notified Iowa that its AML Plan must be amended to comply with the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Act of 1990 and the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Iowa plans to submit a proposed program amendment to OSM in 2002.

Activities that were conducted by the Iowa AML program this evaluation year to ensure that successful on-the-ground reclamation is achieved are shown in the following table. This table, provided to OSM by the IDSC, contains information on Iowa's EY 2001 construction activities, planning activities, project initiatives, inventory activities, and meetings with landowners.

	Iowa Abandoned Mine Land Program Accomplishments (Evaluation Year 10/01/00 - 09/30/01)								
Construction Activities	Planning Activities	Project Initiatives	Inventory Activities	Meetings					
4- New Construction Contracts Awarded	1- Preliminary Reclamation Designs Completed	13 - New Project Eligibility Determinations Completed by the AG's Office	2-New Inventory Sites Updated	0- of Initial Landowner Meetings Held					
9-Active Construction Contracts	1-Preliminary Design Staff Reviews completed	7-Topoogrpahic Maps Completed for New Reclamation Projects	13-Updates to Existing Inventory Sites	1-Of Preliminary Design Landowner Meetings Held					
2- Construction Contracts Completed	1-Geotechinical, Hydrological, and Soils Investigations Completed.	0-Archeological and Historical Surveys Completed	3-Updates for Newly Funded Sites	2-of Final Design Landowner Meetings Held					
2- Maintenance Contracts Developed	3-Final Reclamation Designs Completed	0-Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife Surveys Completed	3-Updates to Add Completed Reclamation	6- of Construction Easement Landowner Meetings Held					
2-Maintenace Contracts Awarded	4- Final Design Reviews Completed	0-Engineering and Design Services Proposals Requested	2-Updates to Amend Completed Construction Costs	0-Public Meetings					
2- Maintenance Contracts Completed		0-New Engineering Design Services Contracts Awarded	2,520 - Linear Ft. of Highwall Eliminated						
62 Acres Reclaimed	2-IDNR Dam Permits Applications	0-In-House Reclamation Designs Initiated	0.6- Acres of Clogged Stream Eliminated						
	3- Environmental Assessments or Categorical Exclusions Completed		33-Acres of Clogged Stream Land Reclaimed						
	3-OSM Authorizations-to Proceed Issued	3	1-acres IRW, 2DI's, 2 acres Dangerous Piles & Embankments						

#### **Regulatory Program**

Late during EY 2001, Iowa submitted a proposed program amendment concerning revegetation provisions. OSM anticipates the proposed amendment will be approved early in EY 2002. Upon approval, several outstanding required amendments at 30 CFR 915.16 will be eliminated.

Reclamation contracts for four bond forfeiture sites were approved and awarded during EY 2001. Work is currently progressing at all four sites and reclamation should be completed in EY 2002.

Iowa has issued Show Cause Orders on seven sites. A hearing before an Administrative Law Judge is scheduled on November 27 and 28, 2001, to review an agreement between the State and the Surety that resolves the issuance of the Show Cause Orders.

During EY 2001, the State collected a total of \$579,565 in bond forfeiture money from forfeiture proceedings relating to five mine sites.

The DSC continues to work with the surety to complete reclamation and maintenance activities at two sites. Iowa expects the surety will seek some phase of bond release in EY 2002.

Iowa is to be commended for the progress it has made in reclaiming sites and in laying the groundwork for bond releases to occur. OSM is optimistic Iowa will release bonded acreage in the next calendar year.

Iowa's FY 2000 and FY 2001 Title V grants were not submitted in a timely manner. In FY 2000, the State committed to timely submission of all grant documents.

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

To further the concept of reporting end results under Title V of SMCRA, 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 and percentage of inspectable units free of off-site impacts, the number of acres that have been mined and reclaimed and which meet the bond release requirements and have been released for the various phases of reclamation, and the effectiveness of customer service provided by the State.

The overall measure of excellence in the AML (Title IV) program is the degree to which States are successful in achieving planned reclamation goals. One of the primary goals of AML topical reviews, referred to as Enhancement and Performance Reviews, is to improve upon this success. These reviews

document each state=s ability to achieve desired outcomes. Emphasizing outcomes allows OSM to identify when the end result is not being achieved and establish a basis for reaching agreement with (and providing assistance to) a State to improve its program.

Individual topic reports that provide details on how the following evaluations and measurements were conducted are available in OSM=s MCRCC in Alton, Illinois.

#### A. Off-site Impacts

A sample of 45 State inspections and 15 Federal inspections were used to evaluate off-site impacts on 19 permits classified as active or non-forfeited. In Iowa, each permit is an inspectable unit.

Most of the off-site impacts identified in Iowa were observed at abandoned sites. The State has addressed existing violations through appropriate enforcement actions. However, without maintenance, these sites will continue to deteriorate until the disturbed areas are reclaimed by the surety or the State.

The inspections and related file information identified nine inspectable units with off-site impacts (Table 4). Eleven off-site impacts, all related to hydrology, were observed on the nine units. The impacts affected land and water resources. Seven, or 64 percent, of the impacts were determined to be moderate, while four were found to be minor. These off-site impacts, all identified prior to EY 2001, were caused either by deterioration of water control structures or lack of maintenance. Ten, or about 53 percent, of the non-forfeited units were free of off-site impacts.

Off-site impacts at non-forfeited sites in Iowa are expected to remain and increase in number and degree until the disturbed sites are reclaimed. They continue to be a problem in Iowa, and OSM is working with the State and sureties to reclaim abandoned mine sites.

A sample of 10 State and five Federal inspections were used to evaluate off-site impacts on the five permit areas where bond was forfeited. Three off-site impacts, all identified prior to EY 2001, were found to exist at three mine sites. All of the impacts related to hydrology and affected water resources. In each case, the magnitude of the environmental impact on the resource was determined to be minor. Two, or approximately 40 percent, of the forfeited sites were free of off-site impacts.

Reclamation plans for the three units with off-site impacts were completed this evaluation year. Extremely wet ground conditions prevented contractors from initiating reclamation work at the

sites in the spring. Work started during the summer, and OSM anticipates the off-site impacts will be eliminated early in EY2002.

#### **B.** Reclamation Success

Directive REG-8, revised July 28, 1999, noted for AReclamation Success," that ASuccess will be determined based on the number of acres that meet the bond release standards and have been released by the State." Successful reclamation includes achievement of approximate original contour, reestablishment of land capability, restoring hydrologic balance, and contemporaneous reclamation. The IDSC received two bond release applications late in this evaluation period. These are the first bond release applications received by the State in over ten years. A final determination on the requests will be made in EY 2002.

On November 26, 1999, OSM published a final rule in the Federal Register that approved, with certain exceptions and additional requirements, the addition of revegetation success guidelines to Iowa=s program. Iowa can now release bond on reclaimed land with certain post-mining land use capabilities. This evaluation year, Iowa submitted a proposed amendment that addressed some of the additional requirements, but a final rule has not been published.

#### C. Customer Service

A review to evaluate Iowa=s effectiveness in providing customer service and public participation in the bond release process was scheduled for EY 2001. Although the State did not process any bond release applications this evaluation year, late in the year one company submitted requests for release of Phase I and Phase II bond at two mine sites. OSM anticipates the State will complete the bond release process on these two sites in EY 2002, at which time OSM will conduct a review to evaluate Iowa=s effectiveness in providing customer service as it pertains to bond release on Title V lands.

Iowa has a computer-based public (citizen) inquiries tracking system that operates as an integral part of the State AML program. This system is routinely used to track public requests for information, assistance, investigations, outreach, and public meetings. It enables the State to provide appropriate consideration, response, and closure to public concerns in a timely manner. Iowa recently added data fields to the tracking system to provide greater consistency in the way public inquiries are addressed. Forty-one contacts with the public were recorded this evaluation year. These contacts were made with landowners of AML projects sites, individuals inquiring about the AML program, and persons inquiring about abandoned underground mines in their areas. Additionally, Iowa coordinated with all appropriate local, State, and Federal agencies in the development and implementation of AML reclamation projects.

A sample of the records was reviewed and Iowa=s actions in handling citizen inquiries were evaluated for timeliness and completeness. The review found that Iowa enters and maintains all public inquiries in the State=s public inquiry tracking system in a timely and professional manner, and expeditiously addresses them.

Based on these findings, OSM believes Iowa addresses and tracks public inquiries in an efficient and effective manner.

#### **D.** Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation

Iowa received \$1.5 million in Federal AML funds this evaluation year. This is the minimum level of funding which OSM allots to any State reclamation program, regardless of coal tonnage mined. However, due to Iowa's participation in the ACSI, the State also received \$173,253 in ACSI funds from OSM.

Iowa does not administer the AML Emergency Program within the State. It conducts an initial investigation and forwards potential emergency complaint information and recommendations to OSM for a final determination. Iowa received six potential AML emergency eligible site inspection requests. Five of the six sites were inspected. One request did not result in an inspection because the IDSC determined, through telephone calls with city employees, that the citizen's concern had already been investigated by the city. It was found not to be mine related. Only one site was declared an emergency

by OSM. Iowa is considering taking over responsibilities for the Emergency Program. OSM is assisting the State with identifying changes to Iowa=s Reclamation Plan and regulations that would be necessary for the State to do so.

During the evaluation period, Iowa completed reclamation begun in previous evaluation years. In EY 2001, IDSC reclaimed AML lands and waters associated with 33 acres of mine lands that contributed to flooding and sedimentation problems, 0.6 miles of stream clogged by mine sediments, two acres of hazardous piles and embankments, two hazardous impoundments, 2,520 feet of dangerous highwalls, and one acre of hazardous Industrial/residential waste. Since program approval in 1983, Iowa has reclaimed 55,010 feet of dangerous highwalls, 813 acres of dangerous spoil piles and embankments, three dangerous impoundments, 22 hazardous water bodies, 13 vertical openings, 7.0 miles of sediment-clogged streams, and 610 acres of mine land contributing to flooding problems.

An OSM evaluation of AML projects found that the Iowa AML program is run in a cost efficient and professional manner. Projects are thoroughly analyzed and conducted in compliance with all National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements. Designs are well thought out, reasonable, cost effective, and use the best current technology available. They also include any necessary mitigation measures for the protection or enhancement of wetlands.

Construction monitoring, post-construction monitoring, and maintenance processes ensure the projects meet contract specifications, project objectives, and program goals.

Iowa=s AML projects result in elimination of extreme hazards to the public and restoration of beneficial land uses. Iowa operates an excellent AML program, and OSM acknowledges its accomplishments.

#### V. OSM Assistance

OSM=s goal is to provide direct technical assistance to Iowa in all aspects of the Technical Information Processing System (TIPS), electronic permitting initiatives, Geographic Information System, Global Positioning System, and other spatial data technologies. OSM is also available to provide support for State symposia/conferences, topical seminars, workshops, interactive forums, specialized on-site training, and technology outreach programs.

During the review period, OSM provided Iowa with the following assistance:

MCRCC staff continued to work with Iowa in preparing for MCRCC assistance in SurvCADD training and in reclamation designs for a bond forfeiture site. A site visit was conducted in August. The State is currently using SurvCADD to work on bond forfeiture designs.

MCRCC provided assistance to Iowa on bond forfeiture reclamation by providing suggestions to the State to reduce the reclamation costs for several sites.

MCRCC has provided Iowa with the latest releases of the TIPS software. The TIPS NT Workstation provided by OSM in early EY 2000 is operational and providing AutoCAD serving, file sharing, and storage capabilities for the State.

The Iowa e-mail service provided by OSM TIPS has been moved from the UNIX Workstation to a centralized POP server. Most of the office staff has e-mail accounts through OSM-TIPS.

#### VII. General Oversight Topic Reviews

The following oversight topics were reviewed during EY 2001. The detailed Evaluation and Findings Reports are available on request to the MCRCC in Alton, Illinois.

#### A. AML On-The-Ground Reclamation

A review of nine projects was conducted to evaluate the success of Iowa=s AML program in achieving successful reclamation. OSM found that reclamation projects were thoroughly analyzed and were in compliance with all NEPA requirements. Project designs are reasonable, cost effective, and use the best technology currently available. Completed AML projects resulted in elimination of extreme hazards to the public and restoration of beneficial land uses. They were completed with minimal disturbance to the environment. Iowa operates an excellent AML program, and OSM acknowledges its accomplishments.

### **B.** AML Customer Service (Public Outreach)

This review was conducted to evaluate Iowa=s timeliness and completeness in handling public inquiries concerning its AML program. Iowa has a computer based public inquiries tracking system used to track public requests for information. This system enables the State to provide appropriate consideration, response, and closure to public concerns. OSM found that Iowa consistently enters and maintains all public inquiries in the tracking system in a timely and professional manner.

## Appendix A: Tabular Summaries of Data Pertaining to Mining, Reclamation, and Program Administration

These tables present data pertinent to mining operations and State and Federal regulatory activities within Iowa. They also summarize funding provided by OSM for Iowa staffing levels. Unless otherwise specified, the reporting period for the data contained in all tables is

October 1, 2000, through September 30, 2001. Additional data used by OSM in its evaluation of Iowa=s performance is available for review in the evaluation files maintained by the MCRCC, Alton, Illinois

## Appendix B: State Comments on Report

In a telephone conversation with Kenneth Tow, Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, Division of Soil Conservation Chief, on November 21, 2001, he noted that he had reviewed the draft OSM 2001 Annual Evaluation Report, and concurred with the findings and conclusions.

**TABLE 1** 

COAL PRODUCTION (Millions of short tons)								
Annual Evaluation Surface Underground Period mines Total								
Coal production <sup>A</sup> for entire State:								
1998	0.000	0.000	0.000					
1999	0.000	0.000	0.000					
2000	0.000	0.000	0.000					
Total	0.000	0.000	0.000					

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.

					TABL							
	As of September 30, 2001  Number and status of permits											
	Activ	e or								Permi	tted ac	reage <sup>A</sup>
Coal mines	tempo	rarily	Inac	ctive						(hundi	reds of	acres)
and related	inac	tive	Pha	se II	Aband	loned	Tot	als	Insp.			
facilities			bond	release					<b>Units</b> <sup>D</sup>			
	IP	PP	IP	PP	IP	PP	IP	PP		IP	PP	Total
STATE AND PRIVA	TE LA	NDS	REGUI	LATOR	Y AUT	HORIT	Y: STA	ATE				
Surface mines	0	14	0	1	2	3	2	18	20	3	44	47
Underground mines	0	2	_	0	0	0	0	2		0	10	10
Other facilities	0	2			0	0	0	2		0	2	2
Subtotals	0	18		_	2	3	2	22	24	3	56	59
FEDERAL LANDS	I .				AUTH					_		_
Surface mines	0	0			0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Underground mines		0		0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Other facilities	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 <sup>B</sup>	1		T									
Surface mines	0	14			2	3	2	18		3	44	47
Underground mines	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	10	10
Other facilities	0	2		0	0	0	0	2		0	2	2
Totals	0	18	0	1	2	3	2	22	24	3	56	59
Average number of pe Average number of ac	_	_			_	_			1 249			
Number of exploration	n permits	s on Sta	ite and p	orivate la	ands:	0			On Fed	leral land	ds <sup>C</sup> :	0
Number of exploration notices on State and private lands: 0 On Federal lands <sup>C</sup> : 0												
IP: Initial regulatory program sites PP: Permanent regulatory program sites												
A When a unit is located on n B Numbers of units may not of in more than one of the prec C Includes only exploration a to a Federal lands program. D Inspectable Units includes a some State programs.	equal the su ceding cate activities re Excludes	um of the gories. gulated by explorati	three prec y the State on regulate	eding cate pursuant ed by the I	gories beca to a cooper Bureau of I	use a sing ative agre	gle inspecta ement with agement.	able unit i	may includ	pursuant		

**TABLE 3** 

## STATE PERMITTING ACTIVITY As of September 30, 2001

Type of		Surface mines		Underground mines		Other facilities			Totals			
Application	App.			App.		, A	App.			App.		
	Rec.	Issued	Acres	Rec.	Issued	Acres	Rec.	Issued	Acres	Rec.	Issued	Acres
New Permits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Renewals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Exploration notices <sup>B</sup>		0			0			0			0	
Revisions (exclusive of incidental boundary revisions)		0			0			0			0	
Incidental boundary revisions		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

OPTIONAL - Number of midterm permit reviews completed that are not reported as revisions. 0

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>A</sup> Includes only the number of acres of proposed surface disturbance.

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													
DEG	REE OF					RESOU	JRCES .	AFFEC:	ГED					
IN.	IPACT		People			Land			Water		,	Structure	S	Total
		minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	
	Blasting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYPE	Land Stability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OF	Hydrology	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	11
IMPACT	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	3	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	11

Total number of inspectable units:

19

Inspectable units free of off-site impacts:

10 or 53%

## OFF-SITE IMPACTS ON BOND FORFEITURE SITES

DEG		RESOURCES AFFECTED												
IMPACT			People			Land			Water			Structures	}	Total
		minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	minor	moderate	major	
	Blasting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYPE	Land Stability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OF	Hydrology	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
IMPACT	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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Total number of inspectable units:

5

Inspectable units free of off-site impacts:

2 or 40%

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	<ul><li>Approximate original contour restored</li><li>Topsoil or approved alternative replaced</li></ul>	0.00			
Phase II	<ul><li>Surface stability</li><li>Establishment of vegetation</li></ul>	0.00			
Phase III	<ul> <li>Post-mining land use/productivity restored</li> <li>Successful permanent vegetation</li> <li>Groundwater recharge, quality and quantity restored</li> <li>Surface water quality and quantity restored</li> </ul>	0.00			
	Bonded Acreage Status <sup>A</sup>	Acres			
(September 30, 20	Total number of bonded acres at end of last review period (September 30, 2000) <sup>B,C</sup> Total number of bonded acres during this evaluation year				
Number of acres l	0.00				
Number of acres	where bond was forfeited during this evaluation this acreage on Table 7)	340.00			

A Bonded acreage is considered to approximate and represent the number of acres disturbed by surface coal mining and reclamation operations.

Bonded acres in this category are those that have not received a Phase III or other final bond release (State maintains jurisdiction).

Reflects adjustment of 1690.00 acres that were not previously identified as released from jurisdiction.

## OPTIONAL TABLE 6 No Table Required

## STATE BOND FORFEITURE ACTIVITY

(Permanent Program Permits)

Bond Forfeiture Reclamation Activity by SRA	Number of Sites	Acres	
Sites with bonds forfeited and collected that were unreclaimed as of September 30, 2000 (end of previous evaluation year) <sup>A</sup>	4	586.00	
Sites with bonds forfeited and collected during Evaluation Year 2001 (current year)	1	340.00	
Sites with bonds forfeited and collected that were re-permitted during Evaluation Year 2001 (current year)	0	0.00	
Sites with bonds forfeited and collected that were reclaimed during Evaluation Year 2001 (current year)	0	0.00	
Sites with bonds forfeited and collected that were unreclaimed as of September 30, 2001 (end of current year) <sup>A</sup>	5	926.00	
Sites with bonds forfeited but uncollected as of September 30, 2001 (end of current year)	0	0.00	
Surety/Other Reclamation (In Lieu of Forfeiture)			
Sites being reclaimed by surety/other party as of September 30, 2000 (end of previous evaluation year) <sup>B</sup>	2	433.00	
Sites where surety/other party agreed to do reclamation during Evaluation Year 2001 (current year)	0	0.00	
Sites being reclaimed by surety/other party that were re-permitted during Evaluation Year 2001 (current year)	0	0.00	
Sites with reclamation completed by surety/other party during Evaluation Year 2001 (current year) <sup>C</sup>	0	0.00	
Sites being reclaimed by surety/other party as of September 30, 2001 (current evaluation year) <sup>B</sup>	2	433.00	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>A</sup> Includes data only for those forfeiture sites not fully reclaimed as of this date

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>B</sup> Includes all sites where surety or other party has agreed to complete reclamation and site is not fully reclaimed as of this date

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup> This number also is reported in Table 5 as Phase III bond release has been granted on these sites

## **IOWA STAFFING** (Full-time equivalents at the end of evaluation year) **Function EY 2001 Regulatory Program** Permit review 1.46 Inspection 0.84 Other (administrative, fiscal, personnel, etc.) 1.35 **Regulatory Program Total** 3.65 4.95 **AML Program Total TOTAL** 8.60

## FUNDS GRANTED TO IOWA BY OSM

(Millions of dollars)

## **EY 2001**

Type of Grant	Federal Funds Awarded	Federal Funding as a Percentage of Total Program Costs			
Administration and Enforcement	\$0.12	50			
Small Operator Assistance	\$0.00	0			
Totals	\$0.12				

# STATE OF IOWA INSPECTION ACTIVITY

PERIOD: OCTOBER 1, 2000 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2001

Inspectable Unit	Number of Inspections Conducted						
Status	Complete	Partial					
Active* 18 Units	72	144					
Inactive* 1 Unit	4	8					
Abandoned* 5 Units	20	40					
Total	96	192					
Exploration	0	0					

<sup>\*</sup> Use terms as defined by the approved State program.

State should provide inspection data to OSM annually, at a minimum, and maintain inspection data on a continual basis. OSM offices responsible for Federal and Indian Programs need not complete this table since data will be queried form the I & E Tracking System.

**TABLE 11** 

# STATE OF IOWA ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY

PERIOD: OCTOBER 1, 2000 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2001

Type of Enforcement	Number of	Number of		
Action	Actions*	Violations*		
Notice of Violation	6	6		
Failure-to-Abate Cessation Order	0	0		
Imminent Harm Cessation Order	0	0		

<sup>\*</sup> Does not include those violations that were vacated.

State should provide enforcement data to OSM annually, at a minimum, and maintain data on a continuous basis. OSM offices responsible for Federal and Indian Programs need not complete this table since data will be queried form the I & E Tracking System.

## LANDS UNSUITABLE ACTIVITY STATE OF IOWA

PERIOD: OCTOBER 1, 2000 - SEPTEMBER 30, 2001

Number of Petitions Received	0		
Number of Petitions Accepted	0		
Number of Petitions Rejected	0		
Number of Decisions Declaring Lands Unsuitable		Acreage Declared as	
	0	Being Unsuitable	0
Number of Decisions Denying Lands Unsuitable		Acreage Denied as	
	0	Being Unsuitable	0

State should provide lands unsuitable data to OSM annually if there is any activity in this program area. OSM OFFICES RESPONSIBLE FOR FEDERAL AND INDIAN PROGRAM STATES MUST ALSO COMPLETE THIS TABLE.