

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Introduction and Welcome





Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Introduction and Welcome

Purpose of the Hearing:

Provide Information on the Proposed Rule



RECENTION AND ENGINEER

Introduction and Welcome

Purpose of the Hearing:

Provide Information on the Proposed Rule
Provide Information on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement



Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Introduction and Welcome

Purpose of the Hearing:

Provide Information on the Proposed Rule
Provide Information on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Get Your Input on both the Proposed Rule and DEIS



Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Introduction and Welcome

Purpose of the Hearing:

Provide Information on the Proposed Rule
Provide Information on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Get Your Input on both the Proposed Rule and DEIS

We Look Forward to Receiving Your Comments

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



The Hearing Agenda

Welcome and informal poster session

PowerPoint Presentation (Continuous)

Written and Private Verbal Comments

Registration for Public Comments

PowerPoint Presentation (Hearing Room)

Public Comments (Hearing Room)

5:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

5:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

5:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

5:00 p.m.

5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.



The Need for a New Rule

Revisions needed to:

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



The Need for a New Rule

Revisions needed to:

 modernize thirty year old regulations to reflect current science and technology



The Need for a New Rule

Revisions needed to:

- modernize thirty year old regulations to reflect current science and technology
- provide regulatory certainty to industry



The Need for a New Rule

Revisions needed to:

- modernize thirty year old regulations to reflect current science and technology
- provide regulatory certainty to industry
- more completely implement the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act



Addressing the Need: Material Damage to the Hydrologic Balance

Revisions needed to:

 define the point at which mining impacts on water outside the permit area are unacceptable



Addressing the Need: Premining Data Collection

Revisions needed to:

 collect adequate premining data about proposed mining sites and adjacent areas to provide a baseline for determination of the impacts of mining



Addressing the Need: Water Monitoring

Revisions needed to:

- monitor groundwater and surface water during/after mining
- detect any adverse trends in time to take corrective measures



Addressing the Need: Protection of Perennial and Intermittent Streams

Revisions needed to:

 ensure protection or restoration of perennial and intermittent streams and related resources



Addressing the Need: Protection of Perennial and Intermittent Streams

Revisions needed to:

- ensure protection or restoration of perennial and intermittent streams and related resources
- ensure establishment of vegetated riparian corridors along all perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams



Addressing the Need: Objective Standards to Make Regulatory and Operational Decisions

Revisions needed to:

ensure the use of objective standards



Addressing the Need: Objective Standards to Make Regulatory and Operational Decisions

Revisions needed to:

- ensure the use of objective standards
- ensure proper, high quality data is available for permitting decisions



Addressing the Need: Using the Latest Science and Technology Available

Revisions needed to:

 ensure mine operators and regulatory authorities use latest science, technology, and methods

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Elements of the Proposed Rule

protection of the hydrologic balance

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- protection of the hydrologic balance
- protection of streams and buffer zones for streams

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- protection of the hydrologic balance
- protection of streams and buffer zones for streams
- postmining land contours

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- protection of the hydrologic balance
- protection of streams and buffer zones for streams
- postmining land contours
- improved soils and revegetation on mined lands/protection of fish and wildlife and water

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Direct Stream Protection Measures

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Direct Stream Protection Measures

• prohibit mining in or within 100 feet of streams unless conditions met

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Direct Stream Protection Measures

- prohibit mining in or within 100 feet of streams unless conditions met
- restoration of hydrological form/ecological function of streams

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Direct Stream Protection Measures

- prohibit mining in or within 100 feet of streams unless conditions met
- restoration of hydrological form/ecological function of streams
- postmining drainage pattern similar to the premining drainage pattern

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Direct Stream Protection Measures

- prohibit mining in or within 100 feet of streams unless conditions met
- restoration of hydrological form/ecological function of streams
- postmining drainage pattern similar to the premining drainage pattern
- 100-foot riparian corridor along all streams using suitable native species

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Handling Excess Spoil

excess spoil fills constructed no larger than necessary to dispose of spoil

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- excess spoil fills constructed no larger than necessary to dispose of spoil
- fills covering streams must meet additional criteria for approval

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- excess spoil fills constructed no larger than necessary to dispose of spoil
- fills covering streams must meet additional criteria for approval
- end-dumping prohibited consistent with the law

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- excess spoil fills constructed no larger than necessary to dispose of spoil
- fills covering streams must meet additional criteria for approval
- end-dumping prohibited consistent with the law
- new criteria and standards for stability/durability of underdrains in fills

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Defining Material Damage to the Hydrologic Balance



Major Feature of the Rule: Defining Material Damage to the Hydrologic Balance

currently undefined in existing law and regulations



Major Feature of the Rule: Defining Material Damage to the Hydrologic Balance

- currently undefined in existing law and regulations
- the definition would create a standard on allowable impacts on water



Major Feature of the Rule: Defining Material Damage to the Hydrologic Balance

- currently undefined in existing law and regulations
- the definition would create a standard on allowable impacts on water
- proposed rule would provide for numerical standards incorporated into permit

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Complete Baseline Data

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Complete Baseline Data

 more complete water sampling to better document premining conditions and establish a baseline for comparison

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Complete Baseline Data

- more complete water sampling to better document premining conditions and establish a baseline for comparison
- parameters include selenium and an assortment of parameters relating to conductivity

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Complete Baseline Data

- more complete water sampling to better document premining conditions and establish a baseline for comparison
- parameters include selenium and an assortment of parameters relating to conductivity
- each location would be sampled once every month for one year

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Monitoring During Mining and Reclamation

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Monitoring During Mining and Reclamation

- improved water monitoring that must continue until final bond release
- biological condition of the streams is to be monitored each year
- monitoring data every five years and order any permit revisions necessary to remedy any adverse trends
- evaluation of monitoring data is part of applications for bond release

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Backfilling and Grading

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Backfilling and Grading

- coal companies are to minimize the generation of excess spoil
- final mine pit cannot be retained as a pond if doing so would create excess spoil or violate approximate original contour
- use backfilling techniques to minimize increases in conductivity and other parameters

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Soils

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Soils

- salvage/redistribute topsoil and subsoil to improve growing conditions for trees and other vegetation
- salvage and use organic matter to improve plant growth and soil ecology
- minimize grading to avoid excessive compaction of the root zone

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Revegetation

mine operators are to use native species to replant mine sites





Major Feature of the Rule: Revegetation

- mine operators are to use native species to replant mine sites
- use of professional forester or ecologist to develop planting plan for site revegetation with trees and shrubs

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Revegetation

- mine operators are to use native species to replant mine sites
- use of professional forester or ecologist to develop planting plan for site revegetation with trees and shrubs
- revegetation success standards must demonstrate restoration of premining capability

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Major Feature of the Rule: Fish and Wildlife

- update/strengthen protection of threatened/endangered species
- protect species proposed for listing as threatened/endangered
- enhancement measures mandatory when mining causes long-term environmental harm

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



The No-Action Alternative

- NEPA requires federal agencies to consider a 'no action' alternative
- in this case, the no action alternative would mean mining would continue under the 1983 Stream Buffer Zone Rule
- thirty-plus years have passed since that rule was implemented; shortcomings identified

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



The No-Action Alternative

- OSMRE may select the no action alternative
- considering the impacts of the no action alternative provides a baseline to compare the current rule with what is proposed

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Considering Reasonable Alternatives

• the no action alternative

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- the no action alternative
- the preferred alternative (the proposed rule)

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- the no action alternative
- the preferred alternative (the proposed rule)
- an alternative that would be more protective of the environment

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- the no action alternative
- the preferred alternative (the proposed rule)
- an alternative that would be more protective of the environment
- an alternative that restores the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- the no action alternative
- the preferred alternative (the proposed rule)
- an alternative that would be more protective of the environment
- an alternative that restores the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule
- alternatives that would apply in special circumstances such as steep slopes

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- the no action alternative
- the preferred alternative (the proposed rule)
- an alternative that would be more protective of the environment
- an alternative that restores the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule
- alternatives that would apply in special circumstances such as steep slopes
- variations of the previous alternatives

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives to Protect Streams

stream miles not filled under the proposed regulations and each alternative

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- stream miles not filled under the proposed regulations and each alternative
- miles of mined-through streams restored under the proposed regulations and under each alternative

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- stream miles not filled under the proposed regulations and each alternative
- miles of mined-through streams restored under the proposed regulations and under each alternative
- miles of stream downstream from the permit area in better condition after mining under the proposed regulations than if mining occurred under the existing regulations

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



- stream miles not filled under the proposed regulations and each alternative
- miles of mined-through streams restored under the proposed regulations and under each alternative
- miles of stream downstream from the permit area in better condition after mining under the proposed regulations than if mining occurred under the existing regulations
- miles of stream that would be preserved indirectly

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Projected Benefits to Streams Under the Preferred Alternative

Results projected for a 21 year period – 2020 to 2040



Projected Benefits to Streams Under the Preferred Alternative

Results projected for a 21 year period – 2020 to 2040

- 6,153 miles of stream improved
- 21 miles of stream preserved
- 84 miles of stream not filled
- 609 miles of streams restored after mining through them

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives to Protect Forests

Results projected for a 21 year period – 2020 to 2040

"Improved Acres," land with improved forest cover under the proposed rule

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives to Protect Forests

Results projected for a 21 year period – 2020 to 2040

- "Improved Acres," land with improved forest cover under the proposed rule
- "Preserved Acres," forest left uncut under the proposed rule, compared to what would occur under existing regulations

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives to Protect Forests

Results projected under the preferred alternative, 2020-2040

- 59,010 acres of forest land would be improved under the proposed rule
- 420 acres of forest land would be preserved

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives: Impact on Coal Production

Results projected under existing regulations, 2020-2040

forecast coal production will continue to decline under existing regulations

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives: Impact on Coal Production

Results projected under existing regulations, 2020-2040

- forecast coal production will continue to decline under existing regulations
- this decline is driven by numerous market conditions such as the price of competing alternative fuel sources

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives: Impact on Coal Production

Results projected under existing regulations, 2020-2040

- forecast coal production will continue to decline under existing regulations
- this decline is driven by numerous market conditions such as the price of competing alternative fuel sources
- declines of approximately 15% (162 million tons) are projected in annual total surface and underground production without any changes to the existing regulations

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Comparing Alternatives: the RIA

Draft Regulatory Impact Analysis of the Alternatives

- Federal agencies are required to consider the costs and benefits of major regulatory revisions
- OSMRE has developed a draft Regulatory Impact Analysis to provide this information

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



RIA: Industry Impacts

- proposed regulations are estimated to impact the coal industry
 - compliance costs
 - coal production
 - employment
- impacts would vary by region

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



RIA: Compliance Costs

COAL REGION	ANNUALIZED COSTS			
OOME REGION	Surface	Underground	Total	
Appalachia	\$17,000,000	\$6,700,000	\$24,000,000	
Colorado Plateau	\$2,500,000	\$200,000	\$2,700,000	
Gulf Coast	\$6,200,000	N/A	\$6,200,000	
IIIinois Basin	\$14,000,000	\$270,000	\$14,000,000	
Northern Rocky Mountains	\$4,800,000	N/A	\$4,800,000	
Northwest	\$98,000	N/A	\$98,000	
Western Interior	\$550,000	\$530	\$550,000	
Total U.S. Compliance Cost Impacts - All Mines	\$45,000,000	\$7,100,000	\$52,000,000	



Proposed Stream Protection Rule



RIA: Coal Production

	BASELINE (MILLION TONS)	PROPOSED RULE (MILLION TONS)	CHANGE (MILLION TONS)	CHANGE (PERCENT)
Appalachian Basin	236	235	(0.9)	-0.36%
Colorado Plateau	56	56	0	0%
Gulf Coast	54	54	0	0%
Illinois Basin	171	170	(0.3)	-0.18%
North Rocky Mountains/ Great Plains	533	532	(0.7)	-0.13%
Northwest	2	2	0	0%
Western Interior	1	1	0	0%
TOTAL	1,053	1,051	(1.9)	-0.18%

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



RIA: Employment Impacts

- production-related employment impacts estimated at 590 to 41 jobs annually, with an average projected annual reduction of 260 jobs.
- compliance-related annual impacts estimated to increase by 210 to 270 jobs annually, with an average annual increase in demand of 250 jobs.
- production related job losses are largely offset by increases in compliance related jobs.

Proposed Stream Protection Rule



Your Role In the Rulemaking Process

- OSMRE is seeking your input on the proposed rule, the DEIS, and the RIA
- examine the information provided, submit your comments in a timely manner
- comments due no later than October 26, 2015





Next Steps

OSMRE will consider all comments while developing the final rule and EIS



Proposed Stream Protection Rule





