

BUFFALO CREEK WATERSHED TMDL Somerset County

For Acid Mine Drainage Affected Segments



Prepared by:

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

January 15, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Directions to the Buffalo Creek Watershed.....	5
Watershed Characteristics.....	5
Segments addressed in this TMDL.....	6
Clean Water Act Requirements	6
Section 303(d) Listing Process	8
Basic Steps for Determining a TMDL.....	9
AMD Methodology.....	9
TMDL Endpoints.....	11
TMDL Elements (WLA, LA, MOS)	12
Allocation Summary	12
Recommendations.....	14
Public Participation.....	17
Future TMDL Modifications	17
Changes in TMDLs That May Require EPA Approval.....	17
Changes in TMDLs That May Not Require EPA Approval.....	18
Method to Quantify Treatment Pond Pollutant Load	29
Load Tracking Mechanisms.....	67
Options for Permittees in TMDL Watersheds	67
Options identified	67
Other possible options	67

TABLES

Table 1. 303(d) Listed Segments	4
Table 2. Applicable Water Quality Criteria.....	12
Table 3. Buffalo Creek Watershed Summary Table.....	13

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A	19
Buffalo Creek Watershed Maps.....	19
Attachment B	25
Method for Addressing Section 303(d) Listings for pH.....	25
Attachment C	28
Method for Calculating Loads from Mine Drainage Treatment Facilities from Surface Mines	28
Attachment D	33
TMDLs By Segment.....	33
Attachment E	59
Excerpts Justifying Changes Between the 1996, 1998, and 2002 Section 303(d) Lists and Integrated Report/List (2004, 2006)	59
Attachment F	62
Water Quality Data Used In TMDL Calculations	62
Attachment G	66

TMDLs and NPDES Permitting Coordination	66
Attachment H	69
Comment and Response.....	69

TMDL¹
Buffalo Creek Watershed
Somerset County, Pennsylvania

Introduction

This report presents the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) developed for segments in the Buffalo Creek Watershed (Attachment A). These were done to address the impairments noted on the 1996 Pennsylvania Section 303(d) list of impaired waters, required under the Clean Water Act, and covers one segment on that list and additional segments on later lists/reports. Buffalo Creek was listed as impaired for metals. All impairments resulted from drainage from abandoned coalmines. The TMDL addresses the three primary metals associated with abandoned mine drainage (iron, manganese, aluminum) and pH.

Table 1. 303(d) Listed Segments										
State Water Plan (SWP) Subbasin: 19F										
HUC: 05020006 Youghieny River										
Year	Miles	Use Designation	Assessment ID	Segment ID	DEP Stream Code	Stream Name	Designated Use	Data Source	Source	EPA 305(b) Cause Code
1996	7.5	*	*	Not in GIS.	39075	Buffalo Creek	CWF	305(b) Report	RE	Metals
1998	7.5	*	*	Not in GIS.	39075	Buffalo Creek	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2002	7.5	*	*	Not in GIS.	39075	Buffalo Creek	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2004	12.9	*	*	20041004-1000-CLW	39075	Buffalo Creek	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2006	2.7	Aquatic Life	11994	*	39075	Buffalo Creek	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals pH
2006	1.12	Aquatic Life	11952	*	39079	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals pH
	2.33		11955							pH
2006	0.33	Aquatic Life	11952	*	39080	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals pH
2006	0.49	Aquatic Life	11952	*	39081	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals pH
2006	0.99	Aquatic Life	11955	*	39082	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	pH
2006	0.66	Aquatic Life	11955	*	39083	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals pH

¹ Pennsylvania's 1996, 1998, and 2002 Section 303(d) lists and the 2004 and 2006 Integrated Water Quality Report were approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The 1996 Section 303(d) list provides the basis for measuring progress under the 1997 lawsuit settlement of *American Littoral Society and Public Interest Group of Pennsylvania v. EPA*.

2006	0.59	Aquatic Life	11955	*	39084	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	pH
2006	1.12	Aquatic Life	11952	*	39085	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
	1.72		11955							pH
2006	0.06	Aquatic Life	11994	*	39115	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2006	0.01	Aquatic Life	11994	*	39117	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2006	0.01	Aquatic Life	11994	*	39118	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2006	1.25	Aquatic Life	11971	*	39126	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2006	0.47	Aquatic Life	11971	*	39127	Buffalo Creek, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2006	0.74	Aquatic Life	11903	*		Tubs Run	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals
2006	0.6	Aquatic Life	11944	*	39102	Millers Run, Unt	CWF	SWMP	AMD	Metals

Resource Extraction=RE

Cold Water Fish = CWF

Surface Water Monitoring Program = SWMP

Abandoned Mine Drainage = AMD

See Attachment D. *Excerpts Justifying Changes Between the 1996, 1998, and 2002 Section 303(d) Lists and the 2004 and 2006 Integrated Water Quality Report.* The use designations for the stream segments in this TMDL can be found in PA Title 25 Chapter 93.

Directions to the Buffalo Creek Watershed

The Buffalo Creek Watershed is located in southwestern Pennsylvania and contains the town of Berlin. The watershed can be accessed by traveling Route 219 south from the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Route 219 parallels Buffalo Creek for much of its length. Additional access is provided by a number of smaller roads including SR2027, SR2023, SR2018, and SR3010.

Watershed Characteristics

The Buffalo Creek Watershed is located in southern Somerset County in Southwestern Pennsylvania. The watershed is located on the U.S. Geological Survey maps covering portions of the Murdock, Berlin and Meyersdale 7.5 minute quadrangles. The area within the watershed encompasses 32 miles². Land use in the watershed includes forestland, cropland, and rural residential uses.

Buffalo Creek originates immediately to the east of Macdonaldton. It flows west-southwest to the town of Garrett where it joins the Casselman River. The watershed is situated in the upland plateau of the Appalachian Physiographic Province. The upland region contains streams which drain to the south and west toward the Ohio River. The headwaters of Buffalo Creek have an approximate elevation of 2700 feet above sea level. The confluence of Buffalo Creek with the Casselman River has an elevation of approximately 1900 feet above sea level.

Segments addressed in this TMDL

Buffalo Creek is affected by pollution from AMD. This pollution has caused high levels of metals in the watershed. The TMDLs will be expressed as long-term, average loadings. Due to the nature and complexity of mining effects on the watershed, expressing the TMDL as a long-term average gives a better representation of the data used for the calculations. See Table 3 for TMDL calculations and see Attachment C for TMDL explanations.

There are numerous facilities that have permits for discharging effluent to water within the Sewickley Creek Watershed. Facilities holding discharge permits have been given waste load allocations (WLAs) within the TMDL calculations.

This AMD TMDL document contains one or more future mining Waste Load Allocations (WLA). These WLA(s) were requested by the Cambria District Mining Office (DMO) to accommodate one or more future mining operations. The District Mining Office determined the number of and location of the future mining WLAs. This will allow speedier approval of future mining permits without the time-consuming process of amending this TMDL document. All comments and questions concerning the future mining WLAs in this TMDL are to be directed to the appropriate DMO. Future wasteload allocations are calculated using the method described for quantifying pollutant load in Attachment C.

The following are examples of what is or is not intended by the inclusion of future mining WLAs. This list is by way of example and is not intended to be exhaustive or exclusive:

1. The inclusion of one or more future mining WLAs is not intended to exclude the issuance of future non-mining NPDES permits in this watershed or any waters of the Commonwealth.
2. The inclusion of one or more future mining WLAs in specific segments of this watershed is not intended to exclude future mining in any segments of this watershed that does not have a future mining WLA.
3. The inclusion of future mining WLAs does not preclude the amending of this AMD TMDL to accommodate additional NPDES permits.

Clean Water Act Requirements

Section 303(d) of the 1972 Clean Water Act requires states, territories, and authorized tribes to establish water quality standards. The water quality standards identify the uses for each waterbody and the scientific criteria needed to support that use. Uses can include designations for drinking water supply, contact recreation (swimming), and aquatic life support. Minimum goals set by the Clean Water Act require that all waters be “fishable” and “swimmable.”

Additionally, the federal Clean Water Act and the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) implementing regulations (40 CFR Part 130) require:

Table 2. List of facilities receiving waste load allocations in the Buffalo Creek TMDL

<i>Mining Permit</i>	<i>NPDES Permit</i>	<i>Permittee</i>	<i>Operation</i>
56000102	PA0235237	Action Mining, Inc.	Long Mine
56020105	PA0249262	Alverda Enterprises, Inc.	Knepper-Coleman Operation
56823108	PA0605751	C&O Coal Company	Burkholder Strip
56823008	PA0608637	Croner, Inc.	Hauger Mine
56890101	PA0598364	Croner, Inc.	Pine Hill Strip
56030105	PA0249726	Croner, Inc.	Buffalo Operation
56841606	PA0110507	Fieg Brothers	Scurfield Preparation Plant
56813104	PA0599115	Finzel Coal Company	Roberts Mine
56930104	PA0212415	Future Industries, Inc.	Merrill Strip
56930107	PA0212466	Future Industries, Inc.	Little Merrill Strip
56940101	PA0212768	Future Industries, Inc.	Krause Strip
56030107	PA0249521	Future Industries, Inc.	Croner Mine
56050107	PA0249866	Future Industries, Inc.	Hickory Hill Mine
56020104	PA0249246	Future Industries, Inc.	Poorbaugh East Mine
56060108	PA0249921	Future Industries, Inc.	Foor Mine
56990103	PA0235172	Future Industries, Inc.	Bittner Mine
56793091	PA0119296	Hardrock Coal Company	Langley Mine
56090103	PA0262358	Mountaineer Mining Corporation	Cober Mine
3366BSM84	PA0248797	Penn Pocahontas Coal Company	Lepley Mine
56743204	PA0214931	Robindale Energy Services	
56070201	PA0262501	Robindale Energy Services	Penn Pocahontas Refuse Reprocessing

- States to develop lists of impaired waters for which current pollution controls are not stringent enough to meet water quality standards (the list is used to determine which streams need TMDLs);
- States to establish priority rankings for waters on the lists based on severity of pollution and the designated use of the waterbody; states must also identify those waters for which TMDLs will be developed and a schedule for development;
- States to submit the list of waters to EPA every two years (April 1 of the even numbered years);

- States to develop TMDLs, specifying a pollutant budget that meets state water quality standards and allocate pollutant loads among pollution sources in a watershed, e.g., point and nonpoint sources; and
- EPA to approve or disapprove state lists and TMDLs within 30 days of final submission.

Despite these requirements, states, territories, authorized tribes, and EPA had not developed many TMDLs. Beginning in 1986, organizations in many states filed lawsuits against the EPA for failing to meet the TMDL requirements contained in the federal Clean Water Act and its implementing regulations. While EPA has entered into consent agreements with the plaintiffs in several states, other lawsuits still are pending across the country.

In the cases that have been settled to date, the consent agreements require EPA to backstop TMDL development, track TMDL development, review state monitoring programs, and fund studies on issues of concern (e.g., AMD, implementation of nonpoint source Best Management Practices (BMPs), etc.).

These TMDLs were developed in partial fulfillment of the 1997 lawsuit settlement of *American Littoral Society and Public Interest Group of Pennsylvania v. EPA*.

Section 303(d) Listing Process

Prior to developing TMDLs for specific waterbodies, there must be sufficient data available to assess which streams are impaired and should be on the Section 303(d) list. With guidance from the EPA, the states have developed methods for assessing the waters within their respective jurisdictions.

The primary method adopted by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for evaluating waters changed between the publication of the 1996 and 1998 Section 303(d) lists. Prior to 1998, data used to list streams were in a variety of formats, collected under differing protocols. Information also was gathered through the Section 305(b)² reporting process. DEP is now using the Statewide Surface Waters Assessment Protocol (SSWAP), a modification of the EPA's 1989 Rapid Bioassessment Protocol II (RBP-II), as the primary mechanism to assess Pennsylvania's waters. The SSWAP provides a more consistent approach to assessing Pennsylvania's streams.

The assessment method requires selecting representative stream segments based on factors such as surrounding land uses, stream characteristics, surface geology, and point source discharge locations. The biologist selects as many sites as necessary to establish an accurate assessment for a stream segment; the length of the assessed stream segment can vary between sites. All the biological surveys included kick-screen sampling of benthic macroinvertebrates and habitat evaluations. Benthic macroinvertebrates are identified to the family level in the field.

² Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act requires a biannual description of the water quality of the waters of the state.

After the survey is completed, the biologist determines the status of the stream segment. The decision is based on habitat scores and a series of narrative biological statements used to evaluate the benthic macroinvertebrate community. If the stream is determined to be impaired, the source and cause of the impairment is documented. An impaired stream must be listed on the state's Section 303(d) list with the source and cause. A TMDL must be developed for the stream segment and each pollutant. In order for the process to be more effective, adjoining stream segments with the same source and cause listing are addressed collectively, and on a watershed basis.

Basic Steps for Determining a TMDL

Although all watersheds must be handled on a case-by-case basis when developing TMDLs, there are basic processes or steps that apply to all cases. They include:

1. Collection and summarization of pre-existing data (watershed characterization, inventory contaminant sources, determination of pollutant loads, etc.);
2. Calculating the TMDL for the waterbody using EPA approved methods and computer models;
3. Allocating pollutant loads to various sources;
4. Determining critical and seasonal conditions;
5. Public review and comment and comment period on draft TMDL;
6. Submittal of final TMDL; and
7. EPA approval of the TMDL.

AMD Methodology

A two-step approach is used for the TMDL analysis of AMD impaired stream segments. The first step uses a statistical method for determining the allowable instream concentration at the point of interest necessary to meet water quality standards. This is done at each point of interest (sample point) in the watershed. The second step is a mass balance of the loads as they pass through the watershed. Loads at these points will be computed based on average annual flow.

The statistical analysis described below can be applied to situations where all of the pollutant loading is from non-point sources as well as those where there are both point and non-point sources. The following defines what are considered point sources and non-point sources for the purposes of our evaluation; point sources are defined as permitted discharges or a discharge that has a responsible party, non-point sources are then any pollution sources that are not point sources. For situations where all of the impact is due to non-point sources, the equations shown below are applied using data for a point in the stream. The load allocation made at that point will be for all of the watershed area that is above that point. For situations where there are point-source impacts alone, or in combination with non-point sources, the evaluation will use the point-source data and perform a mass balance with the receiving water to determine the impact of the point source.

Allowable loads are determined for each point of interest using Monte Carlo simulation. Monte Carlo simulation is an analytical method meant to imitate real-life systems, especially when other analyses are too mathematically complex or too difficult to reproduce. Monte Carlo simulation

calculates multiple scenarios of a model by repeatedly sampling values from the probability distribution of the uncertain variables and using those values to populate a larger data set. Allocations were applied uniformly for the watershed area specified for each allocation point. For each source and pollutant, it was assumed that the observed data were log-normally distributed. Each pollutant source was evaluated separately using @Risk³ by performing 5,000 iterations to determine the required percent reduction so that the water quality criteria, as defined in the *Pennsylvania Code. Title 25 Environmental Protection, Department of Environmental Protection, Chapter 93, Water Quality Standards*, will be met instream at least 99 percent of the time. For each iteration, the required percent reduction is:

$$PR = \text{maximum } \{0, (1-Cc/Cd)\} \text{ where} \tag{1}$$

PR = required percent reduction for the current iteration

Cc = criterion in mg/l

Cd = randomly generated pollutant source concentration in mg/l based on the observed data

$$Cd = \text{RiskLognorm}(\text{Mean}, \text{Standard Deviation}) \text{ where} \tag{1a}$$

Mean = average observed concentration

Standard Deviation = standard deviation of observed data

The overall percent reduction required is the 99th percentile value of the probability distribution generated by the 5,000 iterations, so that the allowable long-term average (LTA) concentration is:

$$LTA = \text{Mean} * (1 - PR99) \text{ where} \tag{2}$$

LTA = allowable LTA source concentration in mg/l

Once the allowable concentration and load for each pollutant is determined, mass-balance accounting is performed starting at the top of the watershed and working down in sequence. This mass-balance or load tracking is explained below.

Load tracking through the watershed utilizes the change in measured loads from sample location to sample location, as well as the allowable load that was determined at each point using the @Risk program.

There are two basic rules that are applied in load tracking; rule one is that if the sum of the measured loads that directly affect the downstream sample point is less than the measured load at

³@Risk – Risk Analysis and Simulation Add-in for Microsoft Excel, Palisade Corporation, Newfield, NY, 1990-1997.

the downstream sample point it is indicative that there is an increase in load between the points being evaluated, and this amount (the difference between the sum of the upstream and downstream loads) shall be added to the allowable load(s) coming from the upstream points to give a total load that is coming into the downstream point from all sources. The second rule is that if the sum of the measured loads from the upstream points is greater than the measured load at the downstream point this is indicative that there is a loss of instream load between the evaluation points, and the ratio of the decrease shall be applied to the load that is being tracked (allowable load(s)) from the upstream point.

Tracking loads through the watershed gives the best picture of how the pollutants are affecting the watershed based on the information that is available. The analysis is done to insure that water quality standards will be met at all points in the stream. The TMDL must be designed to meet standards at all points in the stream, and in completing the analysis, reductions that must be made to upstream points are considered to be accomplished when evaluating points that are lower in the watershed. Another key point is that the loads are being computed based on average annual flow and should not be taken out of the context for which they are intended, which is to depict how the pollutants affect the watershed and where the sources and sinks are located spatially in the watershed.

For pH TMDLs, acidity is compared to alkalinity as described in Attachment B. Each sample point used in the analysis of pH by this method must have measurements for total alkalinity and hot acidity. Statistical procedures are applied, using the average value for total alkalinity at that point as the target to specify a reduction in the acid concentration. By maintaining a net alkaline stream, the pH value will be in the range between six and eight. This method negates the need to specifically compute the pH value, which for streams affected by low pH from AMD may not be a true reflection of acidity. This method assures that Pennsylvania's standard for pH is met when the acid concentration reduction is met.

Information for the TMDL analysis performed using the methodology described above is contained in the "TMDLs by Segment" section of this report.

TMDL Endpoints

One of the major components of a TMDL is the establishment of an instream numeric endpoint, which is used to evaluate the attainment of applicable water quality. An instream numeric endpoint, therefore, represents the water quality goal that is to be achieved by implementing the load reductions specified in the TMDL. The endpoint allows for a comparison between observed instream conditions and conditions that are expected to restore designated uses. The endpoint is based on either the narrative or numeric criteria available in water quality standards.

Because the pollution sources in the watershed are nonpoint sources, the TMDLs' component makeup will be load allocations (LAs) with waste load allocations (WLAs) for permitted discharges. All allocations will be specified as long-term average daily concentrations. These long-term average concentrations are expected to meet water-quality criteria 99% of the time as required in PA Title 25 Chapter 96.3(c). The following table shows the applicable water-quality criteria for the selected parameters.

Table 2. Applicable Water Quality Criteria

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Criterion Value (mg/l)</i>	<i>Total Recoverable/Dissolved</i>
Aluminum (Al)	0.75	Total Recoverable
Iron (Fe)	1.50	30 day average; Total Recoverable
Manganese (Mn)	1.00	Total Recoverable
pH *	6.0-9.0	N/A

*The pH values shown will be used when applicable. In the case of freestone streams with little or no buffering capacity, the TMDL endpoint for pH will be the natural background water quality.

TMDL Elements (WLA, LA, MOS)

$$\text{TMDL} = \text{WLA} + \text{LA} + \text{MOS}$$

A TMDL equation consists of a waste load allocation (WLA), load allocation (LA), and a margin of safety (MOS). The waste load allocation is the portion of the load assigned to point sources. The load allocation is the portion of the load assigned to non-point sources. The margin of safety is applied to account for uncertainties in the computational process. The margin of safety may be expressed implicitly (documenting conservative processes in the computations) or explicitly (setting aside a portion of the allowable load). The TMDL allocations in this report are based on available data. Other allocation schemes could also meet the TMDL.

Allocation Summary

These TMDLs will focus remediation efforts on the identified numerical reduction targets for each watershed. The reduction schemes in Table 3 for each segment are based on the assumption that all upstream allocations are implemented and take into account all upstream reductions. Attachment D contains the TMDLs by segment analysis for each allocation point in a detailed discussion. As changes occur in the watershed, the TMDLs may be re-evaluated to reflect current conditions. An implicit MOS based on conservative assumptions in the analysis is included in the TMDL calculations.

The allowable LTA concentration in each segment is calculated using Monte Carlo Simulation as described previously. The allowable load is then determined by multiplying the allowable concentration by the average flow and a conversion factor at each sample point. The allowable load is the TMDL at that point.

Waste load allocations have also been included at some points for future mining operations. The difference between the TMDL and the WLA at each point is the load allocation (LA) at the point. The LA at each point includes all loads entering the segment, including those from upstream allocation points. The percent reduction is calculated to show the amount of load that needs to be reduced from nonpoint sources within a segment in order for water quality standards to be met at the point.

In some instances, instream processes, such as settling, are taking place within a stream segment. These processes are evidenced by a decrease in measured loading between consecutive sample points. It is appropriate to account for these losses when tracking upstream loading through a

segment. The calculated upstream load lost within a segment is proportional to the difference in the measured loading between the sampling points.

Table 3. Buffalo Creek Watershed Summary Table

Parameter	Existing Load (lbs/day)	TMDL Allowable Load (lbs/day)	WLA (lbs/day)	LA (lbs/day)	NPS Load Reduction (lbs/day)	NPS % Reduction
BUFF12 – Tubs Run in headwaters						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	29.38	6.53	0.56	5.97	22.85*	77%*
Iron (lbs/day)	6.71	6.71	2.25	4.46	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	32.03	15.37	1.50	13.87	16.66*	52%*
Acidity (lbs/day)	-52.01	-52.01	-	-52.01	NA	NA
BUFF11 – Buffalo Creek near Macdonaldton						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	6.34	6.34	0.28	6.06	NA	NA
Iron (lbs/day)	3.80	3.80	1.13	2.67	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	1.72	1.72	0.75	0.97	NA	NA
Acidity (lbs/day)	3.38	3.38	-	3.38	NA	NA
BUFF10 - Unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek near Shaft						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	12.11	6.78	0.28	6.50	5.33	44%
Iron (lbs/day)	2.95	2.95	1.13	1.82	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	2.95	2.95	0.75	2.20	NA	NA
Acidity (lbs/day)	565.99	16.98	-	16.98	549.01	97%
BUFF9 – Buffalo Creek downstream of Salco						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	19.10	19.10	2.25	16.85	NA	NA
Iron (lbs/day)	201.37	50.34	9.01	41.33	151.03*	75%*
Manganese(lbs/day)	102.58	17.44	6.01	11.43	85.14*	83%*
Acidity (lbs/day)	311.78	311.78	-	311.78	NA	NA
BUFF7 – Buffalo Creek downstream of impaired tributary near Goodtown						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	25.54	25.54	3.69	21.85	NA	NA
Iron (lbs/day)	74.27	31.94	10.16	21.78	0*	0%*
Manganese(lbs/day)	51.82	45.60	6.35	39.25	0*	0%*
Acidity (lbs/day)	-3939.48	-3939.48	-	-3939.48	NA	NA
BUFF6 – Unnamed tributary to Millers Run near mouth						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	5.80	5.80	0.56	5.24	NA	NA
Iron (lbs/day)	5.32	5.32	2.26	3.06	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	4.17	4.17	1.50	2.67	NA	NA
Acidity (lbs/day)	-282.01	-282.01	-	-282.01	NA	NA
BUFF5 – Northern site on unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	10.45	3.76	0.28	3.48	6.69	64%
Iron (lbs/day)	1.39	1.39	1.13	0.26	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	2.16	2.16	0.75	1.41	NA	NA
Acidity (lbs/day)	150.71	21.10	-	21.10	129.61	86%
BUFF4 – Southern site on unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	1.83	0.49	0.07	0.42	1.34	73%
Iron (lbs/day)	1.76	1.23	0.28	0.95	0.53	30%

Parameter	Existing Load (lbs/day)	TMDL Allowable Load (lbs/day)	WLA (lbs/day)	LA (lbs/day)	NPS Load Reduction (lbs/day)	NPS % Reduction
Manganese(lbs/day)	0.26	0.26	0.19	0.07	NA	NA
Acidity (lbs/day)	27.24	27.24	-	27.24	NA	NA
BUFF3 – Tubs Run near confluence with Buffalo Creek						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	15.29	15.29	2.25	13.04	NA	NA
Iron (lbs/day)	13.26	13.26	<i>9.01</i>	4.25	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	21.98	19.12	<i>6.01</i>	13.11	0*	0%*
Acidity (lbs/day)	7.94	7.94	-	7.94	NA	NA
BUFF2 – Unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek near Shober						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	15.67	8.62	0.56	8.06	0*	0%*
Iron (lbs/day)	15.27	15.27	1.73	13.54	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	6.98	6.98	1.50	5.48	NA	NA
Acidity (lbs/day)	332.71	53.23	-	53.23	149.87*	74%*
BUFF1 – Buffalo Creek upstream of confluence with Casselman River						
Aluminum (lbs/day)	184.15	99.44	25.19	74.25	77.66*	44%*
Iron (lbs/day)	164.24	164.24	76.91	87.33	NA	NA
Manganese(lbs/day)	205.96	205.96	50.91	155.05	NA	NA
Acidity (lbs/day)	-3756.49	-3756.49	-	-3756.49	NA	NA

NA = not applicable ND = not detected

* Takes into account load reductions from upstream sources.

Waste loads in italics are reserved for future mining operations.

Recommendations

Statewide Reclamation Efforts

Since the 1960s, Pennsylvania has been a national leader in establishing laws and regulations to ensure mine reclamation and well plugging occur after active operation is completed. Mine reclamation and well plugging refer to the process of cleaning up environmental pollutants and safety hazards associated with a site and returning the land to a productive condition, similar to PADEP's Brownfields Program. Pennsylvania is striving for complete reclamation of its abandoned mines and plugging of its orphan wells. These concepts include legislative, policy, and land management initiatives designed to enhance mine operator/volunteer/PADEP reclamation efforts.

Various methods to eliminate or treat pollutant sources provide a reasonable assurance that the proposed TMDLs can be met. These methods include PADEP's primary efforts to improve water quality through reclamation of abandoned mine lands (for abandoned mining) and through the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program (for active mining). Funding sources that are currently being used for projects designed to achieve TMDL reductions include the USEPA 319 grant program and Pennsylvania's Growing Greener Program. Federal funding is through the Department of the Interior's Office of Surface Mining (OSM) for reclamation and mine drainage treatment through the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative and through Watershed Cooperative Agreements.

The PADEP Bureau of District Mining Operations (DMO) administers an environmental regulatory program for all mining activities, including mine subsidence regulation, mine subsidence insurance, and coal refuse disposal. PADEP DMO also conducts a program to ensure safe underground bituminous mining and protect certain structures from subsidence; administers a mining license and permit program; administers a regulatory program for the use, storage, and handling of explosives; and provides for training, examination, and certification of applicants' blaster's licenses. In addition, PADEP Bureau of Mining & Reclamation administers a loan program for bonding anthracite underground mines and for mine subsidence, the Small Operator's Assistance Program (SOAP), and the Remining Operator's Assistance Program (ROAP).

Regulatory programs are assisting in the reclamation and restoration of Pennsylvania's land and water. PADEP has been effective in implementing the NPDES program for mining operations throughout the Commonwealth. This reclamation was done through the use of remining permits that have the potential for reclaiming abandoned mine lands, at no cost to the Commonwealth or the federal government. Long-term agreements were initialized for facilities/operators that need to assure treatment of post-mining discharges or discharges they degraded. These agreements will provide for long-term treatment of discharges. According to OSM, "PADEP is conducting a program where active mining sites are, with very few exceptions, in compliance with the approved regulatory program." Acidity loads from abandoned discharges have been observed to decrease by an average of 61 percent when remined (Smith, Brady, and Hawkins, 2002. "Effectiveness of Pennsylvania's remining program in abating abandoned mine drainage: water quality impacts" in Transactions of the Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration, Volume 312, p. 166-170).

PADEP BAMR, which administers the program to address the Commonwealth's abandoned mine reclamation program, has established a comprehensive plan for abandoned mine reclamation throughout the Commonwealth to prioritize and guide reclamation efforts for throughout the state to make the best use of valuable funds (www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/minres/bamr/complan1.htm). In developing and implementing a comprehensive plan for abandoned mine reclamation, the resources (both human and financial) of the participants must be coordinated to insure cost-effective results. The following set of principles is intended to guide this decision making process:

- Partnerships between the PADEP, watershed associations, local governments, environmental groups, other state agencies, federal agencies, and other groups organized to reclaim abandoned mine lands are essential to achieving reclamation and abating acid mine drainage in an efficient and effective manner.
- Partnerships between AML interests and active mine operators are important and essential in reclaiming abandoned mine lands.
- Preferential consideration for the development of AML reclamation or AMD abatement projects will be given to watersheds or areas for which there is an approved rehabilitation plan (guidance is given in Attachment G).

- Preferential consideration for the use of designated reclamation moneys will be given to projects that have obtained other sources or means to partially fund the project or to projects that need the funds to match other sources of funds.
- Preferential consideration for the use of available moneys from federal and other sources will be given to projects where there are institutional arrangements for any necessary long-term operation and maintenance costs.
- Preferential consideration for the use of available moneys from federal and other sources will be given to projects that have the greatest worth.
- Preferential consideration for the development of AML projects will be given to AML problems that impact people over those that impact property.
- No plan is an absolute; occasional deviations are to be expected.

A detailed decision framework is included in the plan that outlines the basis for judging projects for funding, giving high priority to those projects whose cost/benefit ratios are most favorable and those in which stakeholder and landowner involvement is high and secure.

The Commonwealth is exploring all identified options to address its abandoned mine problem. During 2000-2006, many new approaches to mine reclamation and mine drainage remediation have been explored and projects funded to address problems in innovative ways. These include:

- Awards of grants for: (1) proposals with economic development or industrial application as their primary goal and which rely on recycled mine water and/or a site that has been made suitable for the location of a facility through the elimination of existing Priority 1 or 2 hazards; and (2) new and innovative mine drainage treatment technologies that provide waters of higher purity that may be needed by a particular industry at costs below conventional treatment costs as in common use today or reduce the costs of water treatment below those of conventional lime treatment plants. Eight contracts totaling \$4.075 M were awarded in 2006 under this program.
- Projects using water from mine pools in an innovative fashion, such as the Shannopin Deep Mine Pool (in southwestern Pennsylvania), the Barnes & Tucker Deep Mine Pool (the Susquehanna River Basin into the Upper West Branch Susquehanna River), and the Wadesville Deep Mine Pool (Exelon Generation in Schuylkill County).

There currently isn't a watershed organization interested in the Buffalo Creek Watershed, although there is a watershed group for the larger Casselman River Watershed. It is recommended that agencies work with local interests to form a watershed group that will be dedicated to the remediation and preservation of these watersheds through public education, monitoring and assessment, and improvement projects. Information on formation of a watershed group is available through websites for the PADEP (www.dep.state.pa.us), the AMR Clearinghouse (www.amrclearinghouse.com), the EPA (www.epa.gov), the Susquehanna River Basin Commission (www.srbc.net) and others. In addition, each DEP Regional Office (6) and

each District Mining Office (5) have watershed managers to assist stakeholder groups interested in restoration in their watershed. Most Pennsylvania county conservation districts have a watershed specialist who can also provide assistance to stakeholders (www.pacd.org). Potential funding sources for AMR projects can be found at www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/subject/pubs/water/wc/FS2205.pdf.

Candidate or federally-listed threatened and endangered species may occur in or near the watershed. While implementation of the TMDL should result in improvements to water quality, they could inadvertently destroy habitat for candidate or federally-listed species. TMDL implementation projects should be screened through the Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) early in their planning process, in accordance with the Department's policy titled Policy for Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) Coordination During Permit Review and Evaluation (Document ID# 400-0200-001).

Public Participation

Public notice of the draft TMDL was published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* on September 27, 2008 to foster public comment on the allowable loads calculated. The public comment period on this TMDL was open from September 27, 2008 to November 27, 2008. A public meeting was held on October 28, 2008 at Ebensburg District Mining Office to discuss the proposed TMDL.

Future TMDL Modifications

In the future, the Department may adjust the load and/or wasteload allocations in this TMDL to account for new information or circumstances that are developed or discovered during the implementation of the TMDL when a review of the new information or circumstances indicate that such adjustments are appropriate. Adjustment between the load and wasteload allocation will only be made following an opportunity for public participation. A wasteload allocation adjustment will be made consistent and simultaneous with associated permit(s) revision(s)/reissuances (i.e., permits for revision/reissuance in association with a TMDL revision will be made available for public comment concurrent with the related TMDLs availability for public comment). New information generated during TMDL implementation may include, among other things, monitoring data, BMP effectiveness information, and land use information. All changes in the TMDL will be tallied and once the total changes exceed 1% of the total original TMDL allowable load, the TMDL will be revised. The adjusted TMDL, including its LAs and WLAs, will be set at a level necessary to implement the applicable WQS and any adjustment increasing a WLA will be supported by reasonable assurance demonstration that load allocations will be met. The Department will notify EPA of any adjustments to the TMDL within 30 days of its adoption and will maintain current tracking mechanisms that contain accurate loading information for TMDL waters.

Changes in TMDLs That May Require EPA Approval

- Increase in total load capacity.
- Transfer of load between point (WLA) and nonpoint (LA) sources.
- Modification of the margin of safety (MOS).


- Change in water quality standards (WQS).
- Non-attainment of WQS with implementation of the TMDL.
- Allocations in trading programs.


Changes in TMDLs That May Not Require EPA Approval


- Total loading shift less than or equal to 1% of the total load.
- Increase of WLA results in greater LA reductions provided reasonable assurance of implementation is demonstrated (a compliance/implementation plan and schedule).
- Changes among WLAs with no other changes; TMDL public notice concurrent with permit public notice.
- Removal of a pollutant source that will not be reallocated.
- Reallocation between LAs.
- Changes in land use.


Attachment A


Buffalo Creek Watershed Maps











Attachment B

Method for Addressing Section 303(d) Listings for pH

Method for Addressing Section 303(d) Listings for pH

There has been a great deal of research conducted on the relationship between alkalinity, acidity, and pH. Research published by the Pa. Department of Environmental Protection demonstrates that by plotting net alkalinity (alkalinity-acidity) vs. pH for 794 mine sample points, the resulting pH value from a sample possessing a net alkalinity of zero is approximately equal to six (Figure 1). Where net alkalinity is positive (greater than or equal to zero), the pH range is most commonly six to eight, which is within the USEPA's acceptable range of six to nine and meets Pennsylvania water quality criteria in Chapter 93.

The pH, a measurement of hydrogen ion acidity presented as a negative logarithm, is not conducive to standard statistics. Additionally, pH does not measure latent acidity. For this reason, and based on the above information, Pennsylvania is using the following approach to address the stream impairments noted on the 303(d) list due to pH. The concentration of acidity in a stream is at least partially chemically dependent upon metals. For this reason, it is extremely difficult to predict the exact pH values, which would result from treatment of abandoned mine drainage. When acidity in a stream is neutralized or is restored to natural levels, pH will be acceptable. Therefore, the measured instream alkalinity at the point of evaluation in the stream will serve as the goal for reducing total acidity at that point. The methodology that is applied for alkalinity (and therefore pH) is the same as that used for other parameters such as iron, aluminum, and manganese that have numeric water quality criteria.

Each sample point used in the analysis of pH by this method must have measurements for total alkalinity and total acidity. The same statistical procedures that have been described for use in the evaluation of the metals is applied, using the average value for total alkalinity at that point as the target to specify a reduction in the acid concentration. By maintaining a net alkaline stream, the pH value will be in the range between six and eight. This method negates the need to specifically compute the pH value, which for mine waters is not a true reflection of acidity. This method assures that Pennsylvania's standard for pH is met when the acid concentration reduction is met.

Reference: *Rose, Arthur W. and Charles A. Cravotta, III 1998. Geochemistry of Coal Mine Drainage. Chapter 1 in Coal Mine Drainage Prediction and Pollution Prevention in Pennsylvania. Pa. Dept. of Environmental Protection, Harrisburg, Pa.*




Figure 1. Net Alkalinity vs. pH. Taken from Figure 1.2 Graph C, pages 1-5, of Coal Mine Drainage Prediction and Pollution Prevention in Pennsylvania

Attachment C

**Method for Calculating Loads from Mine Drainage Treatment
Facilities from Surface Mines**

Method to Quantify Treatment Pond Pollutant Load

Calculating Waste Load Allocations for Active Mining in the TMDL Stream Segment.

The end product of the TMDL report is to develop Waste Load Allocations (WLA) and Load Allocations (LA) that represent the amount of pollution the stream can assimilate while still achieving in-stream limits. The LA is the load from abandoned mine lands where there is no NPDES permit or responsible party. The WLA is the pollution load from active mining that is permitted through NPDES.

In preparing the TMDL, calculations are done to determine the allowable load. The actual load measured in the stream is equal to the allowable load plus the reduced load.

$$\text{Total Measured Load} = \text{Allowed Load} + \text{Reduced Load}$$

If there is active mining or anticipated mining in the near future in the watershed, the allowed load must include both a WLA and a LA component.

$$\text{Allowed Load (lbs/day)} = \text{WLA (lbs/day)} + \text{LA (lbs/day)}$$

The following is an explanation of the quantification of the potential pollution load reporting to the stream from permitted pit water treatment ponds that discharge water at established effluent limits.

Surface coalmines remove soil and overburden materials to expose the underground coal seams for removal. After removal of the coal the overburden is replaced as mine spoil and the soil is replaced for revegetation. In a typical surface mining operation the overburden materials is removed and placed in the previous cut where the coal has been removed. In this fashion, an active mining operation has a pit that progresses through the mining site during the life of the mine. The pit may have water reporting to it, as it is a low spot in the local area. Pit water can be the result of limited shallow groundwater seepage, direct precipitation into the pit, and surface runoff from partially regarded areas that have been backfilled but not yet revegetated. Pit water is pumped to nearby treatment ponds where it is treated to the required treatment pond effluent limits. The standard effluent limits are as follows, although stricter effluent limits may be applied to a mining permit's effluent limits to insure that the discharge of treated water does not cause in-stream limits to be exceeded.

Standard Treatment Pond Effluent Limits:

Alkalinity > Acidity

6.0 ≤ pH ≤ 9.0

Fe < 3.0 mg/l

Mn < 2.0 mg/l

Discharge from treatment ponds on a mine site is intermittent and often varies as a result of precipitation events. Measured flow rates are almost never available. If accurate flow data are available, they can be used to quantify the WLA. The following is an approach that can be used

to determine a waste load allocation for an active mining operation when treatment pond flow rates are not available. The methodology involves quantifying the hydrology of the portion of a surface mine site that contributes flow to the pit and then calculating waste load allocation using NPDES treatment pond effluent limits.

The total water volume reporting to ponds for treatment can come from two primary sources: direct precipitation to the pit and runoff from the ungraded area following the pit's progression through the site. Groundwater seepage reporting to the pit is considered negligible compared to the flow rates resulting from precipitation.

In an active mining scenario, a mine operator pumps pit water to the ponds for chemical treatment. Pit water is often acidic with dissolved metals in nature. At the treatment ponds, alkaline chemicals are added to increase the pH and encourage dissolved metals to precipitate and settle. Pennsylvania averages 41.4 inches of precipitation per year (Mid-Atlantic River Forecast Center, National Weather Service, State College, PA, 1961-1990, <http://www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/subject/hotopics/drought/PrecipNorm.htm>). A maximum pit dimension without special permit approval is 1500 feet long by 300 feet wide. Assuming that 5 percent of the precipitation evaporates and the remaining 95 percent flows to the low spot in the active pit to be pumped to the treatment ponds, results in the following equation and average flow rates for the pit area.

$$41.4 \text{ in. precip./yr} \times 0.95 \times 1 \text{ ft./12 in.} \times 1500' \times 300' / \text{pit} \times 7.48 \text{ gal/ft}^3 \times 1 \text{ yr/365 days} \times 1 \text{ day/24 hr.} \times 1 \text{ hr./60 min.} =$$

$$= 21.0 \text{ gal/min average discharge from direct precipitation into the open mining pit area.}$$

Pit water can also result from runoff from the ungraded and revegetated area following the pit. In the case of roughly backfilled and highly porous spoil, there is very little surface runoff. It is estimated that 80 percent of precipitation on the roughly regarded mine spoil infiltrates, 5 percent evaporates, and 15 percent may run off to the pit for pumping and potential treatment (Jay Hawkins, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, Personal Communications 2003). Regrading and revegetation of the mine spoil is conducted as the mining progresses. DEP encourages concurrent backfilling and revegetation through its compliance efforts and it is in the interest of the mining operator to minimize the company's reclamation bond liability by keeping the site reclaimed and revegetated. Experience has shown that reclamation and revegetation is accomplished two to three pit widths behind the active mining pit area. DEP uses three pit widths as an area representing potential flow to the pit when reviewing the NPDES permit application and calculating effluent limits based on best available treatment technology and insuring that in-stream limits are met. The same approach is used in the following equation, which represents the average flow reporting to the pit from the ungraded and unvegetated spoil area.

$$41.4 \text{ in. precip./yr} \times 3 \text{ pit areas} \times 1 \text{ ft./12 in.} \times 1500' \times 300' / \text{pit} \times 7.48 \text{ gal/ft}^3 \times 1 \text{ yr/365 days} \times 1 \text{ day/24 hr.} \times 1 \text{ hr./60 min.} \times 15 \text{ in. runoff/100 in. precipitation} =$$

$$= 9.9 \text{ gal./min. average discharge from spoil runoff into the pit area.}$$

The total average flow to the pit is represented by the sum of the direct pit precipitation and the water flowing to the pit from the spoil area as follows:

$$\text{Total Average Flow} = \text{Direct Pit Precipitation} + \text{Spoil Runoff}$$

$$\text{Total Average Flow} = 21.0 \text{ gal./min} + 9.9 \text{ gal./min.} = 30.9 \text{ gal./min.}$$

The resulting average waste load from a permitted treatment pond area is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Allowable Iron Waste Load Allocation:} \\ &30.9 \text{ gal./min.} \times 3 \text{ mg/l} \times 0.01202 = 1.1 \text{ lbs./day} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Allowable Manganese Waste Load Allocation:} \\ &30.9 \text{ gal./min.} \times 2 \text{ mg/l} \times 0.01202 = 0.7 \text{ lbs./day} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Allowable Aluminum Waste Load Allocation:} \\ &30.9 \text{ gal./min.} \times 0.75 \text{ mg/l} \times 0.01202 = 0.3 \text{ lbs./day} \end{aligned}$$

(Note: 0.01202 is a conversion factor to convert from a flow rate in gal./min. and a concentration in mg/l to a load in units of lbs./day.)

There is little or no documentation available to quantify the actual amount of water that is typically pumped from active pits to treatment ponds. Experience and observations suggest that the above approach is very conservative and overestimates the quantity of water, creating a large margin of safety in the methodology. County specific precipitation rates can be used in place of the long-term state average rate, although the margin of safety is greater than differences from individual counties. It is common for many mining sites to have very “dry” pits that rarely accumulate water that would require pumping and treatment.

Also, it is the goal of DEP’s permit review process to not issue mining permits that would cause negative impacts to the environment. As a step to insure that a mine site does not produce acid mine drainage, it is common to require the addition of alkaline materials (waste lime, baghouse lime, limestone, etc.) to the backfill spoil materials to neutralize any acid-forming materials that may be present. This practice of ‘alkaline addition’ or the incorporation of naturally occurring alkaline spoil materials (limestone, alkaline shale or other rocks) may produce alkaline pit water with very low metals concentrations that does not require treatment. A comprehensive study in 1999 evaluated mining permits issued since 1987 and found that only 2.2 percent resulted in a post-mining pollution discharge (Evaluation of Mining Permits Resulting in Acid Mine Drainage 1987-1996: A Post Mortem Study, March 1999). As a result of efforts to insure that acid mine drainage is prevented, most mining operations have alkaline pit water that often meets effluent limits and requires little or no treatment.

While most mining operations are permitted and allowed to have a standard, 1500’ x 300’ pit, most are well below that size and have a corresponding decreased flow and load. Where pit dimensions are greater than the standard size or multiple pits are present, the calculations to define the potential pollution load can be adjusted accordingly. Hence, the above calculated

Waste Load Allocation is very generous and likely high compared to actual conditions that are generally encountered. A large margin of safety is included in the WLA calculations.

The allowable load for the stream segment is determined by modeling of flow and water quality data. The allowable load has a potential Waste Load Allocation (WLA) component if there is active mining or anticipated future mining and a Load Allocation (LA). So, the sum of the Load Allocation and the Waste Load Allocation is equal to the allowed load. The WLA is determined by the above calculations and the LA is determined by the difference between the allowed load and the WLA.

$$\text{Allowed Load} = \text{Waste Load Allocation} + \text{Load Allocation}$$

Or

$$\text{Load Allocation} = \text{Allowed Load} - \text{Waste Load Allocation}$$

This is an explanation of the quantification of the potential pollution load reporting to the stream from permitted pit water treatment ponds that discharge water at established effluent limits. This allows for including active mining activities and their associated Waste Load in the TMDL calculations to more accurately represent the watershed pollution sources and the reductions necessary to achieve in-stream limits. When a mining operation is concluded its WLA is available for a different operation. Where there are indications that future mining in a watershed may be greater than the current level of mining activity, an additional WLA amount may be included in the allowed load to allow for future mining.

Attachment D

TMDLs By Segment

Buffalo Creek

The TMDL for Buffalo Creek consists of load allocations to four sampling sites on Buffalo Creek (BUFF11, BUFF9, BUFF7 and BUFF1), four sites on unnamed tributaries to Buffalo Creek (BUFF10, BUFF5, BUFF4, and BUFF2), one site on an unnamed tributary to Millers Run (BUFF6), and two sites on Tubs Run (BUFF12 and BUFF3). Sample data sets were collected in 2007 and 2008. All sample points are shown on the maps included in Attachment A as well as on the loading schematic presented on the following page.


Buffalo Creek is listed on the 1996 PA Section 303(d) list for metals from AMD as being the cause of the degradation to this stream. Although this TMDL will focus primarily on metal loading to the Buffalo Creek Watershed, acid loading analysis will be performed. The objective is to reduce acid loading to the stream, which will in turn raise the pH to the desired range (between 6 & 9) 99% of the time. The result of this analysis is an acid loading reduction that equates to meeting standards for pH (see TMDL Endpoint section in the report, Table 2). The method and rationale for addressing pH is contained in Attachment B.

An allowable long-term average in-stream concentration was determined at each sample point for metals and acidity. The analysis is designed to produce an average value that, when met, will be protective of the water-quality criterion for that parameter 99% of the time. An analysis was performed using Monte Carlo simulation to determine the necessary long-term average concentration needed to attain water-quality criteria 99% of the time. The simulation was run assuming the data set was log normally distributed. Using the mean and standard deviation of the data set, 5000 iterations of sampling were completed, and compared against the water-quality criterion for that parameter. For each sampling event a percent reduction was calculated, if necessary, to meet water-quality criteria. A second simulation that multiplied the percent reduction times the sampled value was run to insure that criteria were met 99% of the time. The mean value from this data set represents the long-term average concentration that needs to be met to achieve water-quality standards. Following is an explanation of the TMDL for each allocation point.

Buffalo Creek Sampling Station Diagram

Arrows represent direction of flow

Diagram not to scale



A waste load allocation for future mining was included at BUFF11 allowing for one operation with one active pit (1500' x 300') to be permitted in the future on this segment.

Table D1. Waste load allocations for future mining operations			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
Future Operation 1			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	3.0	0.045	1.13
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75

TMDL calculations - BUFF11 Buffalo Creek in headwaters

The TMDL for sampling point BUFF11 consists of a load allocation to all of the area upstream of this point shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for this segment of Buffalo Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF11. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF11 (3.04 MGD), is used for these computations. The allowable load allocations calculated at BUFF11 will directly affect the downstream point BUFF09.

Sample data at point BUFF11 shows pH ranging between 7.0 and 7.4; pH not will be addressed because water quality standards are being met. Water quality standards are being met for iron, aluminum and manganese; therefore, TMDLs are not necessary for these parameters at BUFF11.

Table D2 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF11.

Table D2		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.25	6.34	0.25	6.34
	Iron	0.15	3.80	0.15	3.80
	Manganese	0.07	1.72	0.07	1.72
	Acidity	0.13	3.38	0.13	3.38
	Alkalinity	23.33	591.58		

A waste load allocation for future mining was included at BUFF10 allowing for one operation with one active pit (1500' x 300') to be permitted in the future on this segment.

Table D3. Waste load allocations for future mining operations			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow	Allowable Load
		(MGD)	(lbs/day)
Future Operation 1			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	3.0	0.045	1.13
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75

TMDL calculations- BUFF10 Unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek near Shaft

The TMDL for sampling point BUFF10 consists of a load allocation to all of the area upstream of this point shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for the unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF10. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF10 (2.36 MGD), is used for these computations.

Sample data at point BUFF10 shows pH ranging between 4.6 and 5.3; pH will be addressed. Table D4 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF10. Table D5 shows the load reductions necessary to meet water quality standards at BUFF10.

Table D4		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.62	12.11	0.34	6.78
	Iron	0.15	2.95	0.15	2.95
	Manganese	0.15	2.95	0.15	2.95
	Acidity	28.80	565.99	0.86	16.98
	Alkalinity	6.64	130.49		

Table D5. Allocations BUFF10		
BUFF10	Al (Lbs/day)	Acidity (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF10	12.11	565.99
Allowable Load @ BUFF10	6.78	16.98
Load Reduction @ BUFF10	5.33	549.01
% Reduction required @ BUFF10	44%	97%

A waste load allocation for future mining was included at BUFF9 allowing for four operations with two active pits (1500' x 300') to be permitted in the future on this segment.

Table D6. Waste load allocations for future mining operations			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow	Allowable Load
		(MGD)	(lbs/day)
Future Operation 1			
Al	0.75	0.36	2.25
Fe	3.0	0.36	9.01
Mn	2.0	0.36	6.01

TMDL calculations- BUFF9 –Buffalo Creek downstream of Salco

The TMDL for sample point BUFF9 consists of a load allocation to all of the area between BUFF9 and BUFF11 shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for this segment of Buffalo Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF9. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF9 (9.16 MGD), is used for these computations. The allowable load allocations calculated at BUFF9 will directly affect the downstream point BUFF7.

Sample data at point BUFF9 shows that this segment has a pH ranging between 6.5 and 7.1; pH will not be addressed because water quality standards are being met. Table D7 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF9. Table D8 shows the percent reductions for aluminum, iron and manganese.

Table D7		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.25	19.10	0.25	19.10
	Iron	2.64	201.37	0.66	50.34
	Manganese	1.34	102.58	0.23	17.44
	Acidity	4.08	311.78	4.08	311.78
	Alkalinity	22.40	1711.72		

The measured and allowable loading for point BUFF9 for iron and manganese was computed using water-quality sample data collected at the point. This was based on the sample data for the point and did not account for any loads already specified from upstream sources. The additional load from points BUFF9 shows the total load that was permitted from upstream sources. This value was added to the difference in existing loads between points BUFF10/11 and BUFF9 to determine a total load tracked for the segment of stream between BUFF9 and BUFF10/11. This load will be compared to the allowable load to determine if further reductions are needed to meet the calculated TMDL at BUFF9.

Table D8. Allocations BUFF9		
BUFF9	Fe (Lbs/day)	Mn (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF9	201.37	102.58
Difference in measured Loads between the loads that enter and existing BUFF9	194.62	97.91
Additional load tracked from above samples	6.75	4.67
Total load tracked between BUFF10/11 and BUFF9	201.37	102.58
Allowable Load @ BUFF9	50.34	17.44
Load Reduction @ BUFF9	151.03	85.14
% Reduction required at BUFF9	75%	83%

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Poorbaugh East (SMP56020104)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56020104; NPDES PA0249246) Poorbaugh East has one mine drainage treatment facility requiring treatment. Outfall 001 is a discharge from a treatment facility. This discharge point can discharge from two (2) 1500’X300’ pits simultaneously. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D9. Waste load allocation PA0249246			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.7	0.09	0.53
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50

Waste Load Allocation – Croner, Inc. Hauger Mine (SMP56823008)

Croner, Inc. (SMP56823008; NPDES PA0608637) Hauger Mine has seven mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-007 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D10. Waste load allocation PA0608637			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.005	0.03
Fe	3.0	0.005	0.13
Mn	2.0	0.005	0.08
002			
Al	0.75	0.005	0.03
Fe	3.0	0.005	0.13
Mn	2.0	0.005	0.08
003			
Al	0.75	0.005	0.03
Fe	3.0	0.005	0.13
Mn	2.0	0.005	0.08
004			
Al	0.75	0.005	0.03
Fe	3.0	0.005	0.13
Mn	2.0	0.005	0.08
005			
Al	0.75	0.005	0.03
Fe	3.0	0.005	0.13
Mn	2.0	0.005	0.08
006			
Al	0.75	0.005	0.03
Fe	3.0	0.005	0.13
Mn	2.0	0.005	0.08
007			
Al	0.75	0.005	0.03
Fe	3.0	0.005	0.13
Mn	2.0	0.005	0.08

Waste Load Allocation – Robindale Energy Services (SMP56743204)

Robindale Energy Services (SMP56743204; NPDES PA0214931) has one mine drainage treatment facility requiring treatment. Outfall 001 is a discharge from a treatment facility. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D11. Waste load allocation PA0214931			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83

Waste Load Allocation – C&O Coal Company Burkholder Strip (SMP56823108)

C&O Coal Company (SMP56823108; NPDES PA0605751) Burkholder Strip has one mine drainage treatment facility requiring treatment. Outfall 001 is a discharge from a treatment facility. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D12. Waste load allocation PA0605751			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83

Waste Load Allocation – Mountaineer Mining Corporation Cober Mine (SMP56090103)

Mountaineer Mining Corporation (SMP56090103; NPDES PA0262358) Cober Mine has two mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-002 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D13. Waste load allocation PA0262358			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
TP1			
Al	2.0	0.09	1.50
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
TP2			
Al	1.1	0.09	0.83
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	1.5	0.09	1.13

TMDL calculations- BUFF7 – Buffalo Creek near Goodtown

The TMDL for sampling point BUFF7 consists of a load allocation to all of the area between BUFF9 and BUFF7 shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for this segment of Buffalo

Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF7. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF7 (12.25 MGD), is used for these computations.

Sample data at point BUFF7 shows pH ranging between 7.4 and 7.6; pH will not be addressed because water quality standards are being met. Table D14 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF7. Table D15 shows the percent reduction for iron and manganese needed at BUFF7.

Table D14		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.25	25.54	0.25	25.54
	Iron	0.73	74.27	0.31	31.94
	Manganese	0.51	51.82	0.45	45.60
	Acidity	-38.56	-3939.48	-38.56	-3939.48
	Alkalinity	60.88	6219.81		

The measured and allowable loading for point BUFF7 for iron and manganese was computed using water-quality sample data collected at the point. This was based on the sample data for the point and did not account for any loads already specified from upstream sources. The additional load from points BUFF9 shows the total load that was permitted from upstream sources. This value was added to the difference in existing loads between points BUFF9 and BUFF7 to determine a total load tracked for the segment of stream between BUFF7 and BUFF9. This load will be compared to the allowable load to determine if further reductions are needed to meet the calculated TMDL at BUFF7.

Table D15. Allocations BUFF7		
BUFF7	Fe (Lbs/day)	Mn (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF7	74.27	51.82
Difference in measured Loads between the loads that enter and existing BUFF7	-127.10	-50.76
Additional load tracked from above samples	50.34	17.44
Total load tracked between BUFF9 and BUFF7	18.63	8.89
Allowable Load @ BUFF7	31.94	45.60
Load Reduction @ BUFF7	0	0
% Reduction required at BUFF7	0%	0%

Waste Load Allocation – Hardrock Coal Co. Langley Mine (SMP56793091)

Hardrock Coal Co. (SMP56793091; NPDES PA0119296) Langley Mine has two mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 013 and 030 are discharges from treatment facilities. Each discharge point can discharge from one (1) 1500’X300’ pit simultaneously. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D16. Waste load allocation PA0119296			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow	Allowable Load
		(MGD)	(lbs/day)
013			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	3.0	0.045	1.13
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75
030			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	3.0	0.045	1.13
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75

TMDL calculations- BUFF6- Unnamed tributary to Millers Run at mouth

The TMDL for sampling point BUFF6 consists of a load allocation to all of the area upstream of this point shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for this segment of the unnamed tributary to Millers Run was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF6. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF6 (2.78 MGD), is used for these computations.

Water quality standards are being met for iron, aluminum and manganese; therefore, TMDLs are not necessary for these parameters at BUFF6. Table D17 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF7.

Table D17		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.25	5.80	0.25	5.80
	Iron	0.23	5.32	0.23	5.32
	Manganese	0.18	4.17	0.18	4.17
	Acidity	-12.16	-282.01	-12.16	-282.01
	Alkalinity	32.16	745.85		

A waste load allocation for future mining was included at BUFF12 allowing for one operation with two active pits (1500' x 300') to be permitted in the future on this segment.

Table D18. Waste load allocations for future mining operations			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
Future Operation 1			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50

TMDL calculations- BUFF12- Tubs Run in the headwaters

The TMDL for sampling point BUFF12 consists of a load allocation to all of the area upstream of this point shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for Tubs Run was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF12. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF12 (3.25 MGD), is used for these computations.

Sample data at point BUFF12 shows pH ranging between 6.8 and 7.4; pH will not be addressed because water quality standards are being met. Table D19 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF12. Table D20 shows the load reductions necessary to meet water quality standards at BUFF12.

Table D19		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	1.05	29.38	0.24	6.53
	Iron	0.25	6.71	0.25	6.71
	Manganese	1.18	32.03	0.57	15.37
	Acidity	-1.92	-52.01	-1.92	-52.01
	Alkalinity	19.20	520.10		

Table D20. Allocations BUFF12		
BUFF12	Al (Lbs/day)	Mn (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF12	29.38	32.03
Allowable Load @ BUFF12	6.53	15.37
Load Reduction @ BUFF12	22.85	16.66
% Reduction required @ BUFF12	77%	52%

A waste load allocation for future mining was included at BUFF3 allowing for four operations with two active pits (1500' x 300') to be permitted in the future on this segment.

Table D21. Waste load allocations for future mining operations			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
Future Operation 1			
Al	0.75	0.36	2.25
Fe	3.0	0.36	9.01
Mn	2.0	0.36	6.01

TMDL calculations- BUFF3- Tubs Run at mouth

The TMDL for sample point BUFF3 consists of a load allocation to all of the area between BUFF12 and BUFF3 shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for this segment of Tubs Run was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF3. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF3 (5.95 MGD), is used for these computations. The allowable load allocations calculated at BUFF3 will directly affect the downstream point BUFF1.

Sample data at point BUFF3 shows that this segment has a pH ranging between 5.8 and 7.4; pH will not be addressed because water quality standards are being met. Table D22 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF3. Table D23 shows the percent reductions for aluminum, iron and manganese.

Table D22		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration mg/L	Load lbs/day	Concentration mg/L	Load lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.31	15.29	0.31	15.29
	Iron	0.27	13.26	0.27	13.26
	Manganese	0.44	21.98	0.39	19.12
	Acidity	0.16	7.94	0.16	7.94
	Alkalinity	19.44	965.09		

The measured and allowable loading for point BUFF3 for aluminum, iron and manganese was computed using water-quality sample data collected at the point. This was based on the sample data for the point and did not account for any loads already specified from upstream sources. The additional load from points BUFF3 shows the total load that was permitted from upstream sources. This value was added to the difference in existing loads between points BUFF12 and BUFF3 to determine a total load tracked for the segment of stream between BUFF3 and BUFF12. This load will be compared to the allowable load to determine if further reductions are needed to meet the calculated TMDL at BUFF3.

Table D23. Allocations BUFF3	
BUFF3	Mn (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF3	21.98
Difference in measured loads between the loads that enter and existing BUFF3	-10.05
Additional load tracked from above samples	15.37
Total load tracked between BUFF12 and BUFF3	10.61
Allowable Load @ BUFF3	19.12
Load Reduction @ BUFF3	0
% Reduction required at BUFF3	0%

Waste Load Allocation –Action Mining, Inc. Long Mine (SMP56000102)

Action Mining, Inc. (SMP56000102; NPDES PA0235237) Long Mine has three mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 002, 004 and 005 are discharges from treatment facilities. This permit can discharge up to 10 gallons per minute (0.01441 MGD) from any one treatment facility. The following table shows the waste load allocation for these discharges.

Table D24. Waste load allocation PA0235237			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
002			
Al	0.6	0.01441	0.07
Fe	2.3	0.01441	0.28
Mn	1.6	0.01441	0.19
004			
Al	0.6	0.01441	0.007
Fe	2.3	0.01441	0.28
Mn	1.6	0.01441	0.19
005			
Al	0.4	0.01441	0.05
Fe	1.1	0.01441	0.13
Mn	0.7	0.01441	0.08

TMDL calculations- BUFF4- southern unnamed tributaries to Buffalo Creek

The TMDL for sampling point BUFF4 consists of a load allocation to all of the area upstream of this point shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for the unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF4. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF4 (0.43 MGD), is used for these computations.

Sample data at point BUFF4 shows pH ranging between 6.6 and 6.95; pH will not be addressed because water quality standards are being met. Table D25 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF4. Table D26 shows the load reductions necessary to meet water quality standards at BUFF4.

Table D25		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.51	1.83	0.14	0.49
	Iron	0.49	1.76	0.34	1.23
	Manganese	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.26
	Acidity	7.54	27.24	7.54	27.24
	Alkalinity	12.68	45.18		

Table D26. Allocations BUFF4		
BUFF4	Al (Lbs/day)	Fe (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF4	1.83	1.76
Allowable Load @ BUFF4	0.49	1.23
Load Reduction @ BUFF4	1.34	0.53
% Reduction required @ BUFF4	73%	30%

Waste Load Allocation – Fieg Brothers Scurfield Preparation Plant (SMP56841606)

Fieg Brothers (SMP56841606; NPDES PA0110507) Scurfield Preparation Plant has two mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 002 and 003 are discharges from treatment facilities. The permit may discharge up to 0.045 MGD from the permit at any one time. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D27. Waste load allocation PA0110507			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
002			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	3.0	0.045	1.13
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75
003			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	3.0	0.045	1.13
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75

TMDL calculations- BUFF5- northern unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek

The TMDL for sampling point BUFF5 consists of a load allocation to all of the area upstream of this point shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for the unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF5. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF5 (1.11 MGD), is used for these computations.

Sample data at point BUFF5 shows pH ranging between 4.7 and 5.1; pH will be addressed. Table D28 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF5. Table D29 shows the load reductions necessary to meet water quality standards at BUFF5.

Table D28		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	1.13	10.45	0.41	3.76
	Iron	0.15	1.39	0.15	1.39
	Manganese	0.23	2.16	0.23	2.16
	Acidity	16.28	150.71	2.28	21.10
	Alkalinity	6.76	62.58		

Table D29. Allocations BUFF5		
BUFF5	Al (Lbs/day)	Acidity (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF5	10.45	150.71
Allowable Load @ BUFF5	3.76	21.10
Load Reduction @ BUFF5	6.69	129.61
% Reduction required @ BUFF	64%	86%

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Hickory Hill (SMP56050107)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56050107; NPDES PA0249866) Hickory Hill has one mine drainage treatment facility requiring treatment. Outfall 002 is a discharge from a treatment facility. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D30. Waste load allocation PA0249866			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
002			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	1.6	0.045	0.60
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75

Waste Load Allocation – Robindale Energy Services Penn Pocahontas Refuse Reprocessing (SMP56070201)

Robindale Energy Services (SMP56070201; NPDES PA0262501) Penn Pocahontas Refuse Reprocessing has one mine drainage treatment facility requiring treatment. Outfall 001 is a discharge from a treatment facility. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D31. Waste load allocation PA0262501			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow	Allowable Load
		(MGD)	(lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.045	0.28
Fe	3.0	0.045	1.13
Mn	2.0	0.045	0.75

TMDL calculations- BUFF2- Unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek at mouth

The TMDL for sample point BUFF2 consists of a load allocation to all of the area between BUFF4/5 and BUFF2 shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for this segment of the unnamed tributary to Buffalo Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF2. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF2 (3.00 MGD), is used for these computations. The allowable load allocations calculated at BUFF2 will directly affect the downstream point BUFF1.

Sample data at point BUFF2 shows that this segment has a pH ranging between 5.8 and 6.5; pH will be addressed. Table D32 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF2. Table D33 shows the percent reductions for aluminum, iron, manganese and acidity.

Table D32		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.63	15.67	0.34	8.62
	Iron	0.61	15.27	0.61	15.27
	Manganese	0.28	6.98	0.28	6.98
	Acidity	13.28	332.71	2.12	53.23
	Alkalinity	0.61	15.27		

The measured and allowable loading for point BUFF2 for aluminum, iron and manganese was computed using water-quality sample data collected at the point. This was based on the sample data for the point and did not account for any loads already specified from upstream sources. The additional load from points BUFF2 shows the total load that was permitted from upstream sources. This value was added to the difference in existing loads between points BUFF4/5 and BUFF2 to determine a total load tracked for the segment of stream between BUFF2 and BUFF4/5. This load will be compared to the allowable load to determine if further reductions are needed to meet the calculated TMDL at BUFF2.

Table D33. Allocations BUFF2		
BUFF2	Al (Lbs/day)	Acid (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF2	15.67	332.71
Difference in measured Loads between the loads that enter and existing BUFF2	3.39	154.76
Additional load tracked from above samples	4.25	48.34
Total load tracked between BUFF4/5 and BUFF2	7.64	203.10
Allowable Load @ BUFF2	8.62	53.23
Load Reduction @ BUFF2	0	149.87
% Reduction required at BUFF2	0%	74%

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Krause Strip (SMP56940101)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56940101; NPDES PA0212768) Krause Strip has four mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-004 are discharges from treatment facilities. Each discharge point can discharge from one (1) 1500'X300' pit only. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D34. Waste load allocation PA0212768			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	1.9	0.05	0.79
002			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	1.9	0.05	0.79
003			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83
004			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	2.6	0.05	1.08
Mn	1.0	0.05	0.42

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Foor Mine (SMP56060108)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56060108; NPDES PA0249921) Foor Mine has three mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-003 are discharges from treatment facilities. Each discharge point can discharge from two (2) 1500'X300' pits simultaneously. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D35. Waste load allocation PA0249921			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	2.0	0.09	1.50
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
002			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
003			
Al	2.0	0.09	1.50
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Croner Mine (SMP56030107)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56030107; NPDES PA0249521) Croner Mine has four mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-004 are discharges from treatment facilities. Each discharge point can discharge from two (2) 1500’X300’ pits simultaneously. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D36. Waste load allocation PA0249521			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
002			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
003			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
004			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Little Merrill Strip (SMP56930107)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56930107; NPDES PA0212466) Little Merrill Strip has three mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-003 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D37. Waste load allocation PA0212466			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83
002			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83
003			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83

Waste Load Allocation – Croner, Inc. Buffalo Operation (SMP56030105)

Croner, Inc. (SMP56030105; NPDES PA0249726) Buffalo Operation has four mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-004 are discharges from treatment facilities. Each discharge point can discharge from two (2) 1500'X300' pits simultaneously. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D38. Waste load allocation PA0249726			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
002			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
003			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
004			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50

Waste Load Allocation – Penn Pocahontas Coal Co. Lepley Mine (3366BSM84)

Penn Pocahontas Coal Co. (3366BSM84; NPDES PA0248797) Lepley Mine has two mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-002 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D39. Waste load allocation PA0248797			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.017	0.11
Fe	3.0	0.017	0.43
Mn	2.0	0.017	0.28
002			
Al	0.75	0.041	0.26
Fe	3.0	0.041	1.03
Mn	2.0	0.041	0.68

Waste Load Allocation – Croner, Inc. Pine Hill Strip (SMP56890101)

Croner, Inc. (SMP56890101; NPDES PA0598364) Pine Hill Strip has three mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-003 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D40. Waste load allocation PA0598364			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83
002			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83
003			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	3.0	0.05	1.25
Mn	2.0	0.05	0.83

Waste Load Allocation – Finzel Coal Company Roberts Mine (SMP56813104)

Finzel Coal Company (SMP56813104; NPDES PA0599115) Roberts Mine has three mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-003 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D41. Waste load allocation PA0599115			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.26	1.63
Fe	3.0	0.26	6.51
Mn	2.0	0.26	4.34
002			
Al	0.75	0.30	1.88
Fe	3.0	0.30	7.51
Mn	2.0	0.30	5.00
003			
Al	0.75	0.25	1.56
Fe	3.0	0.25	6.23
Mn	2.0	0.25	4.17

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Merrill Strip (SMP56930104)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56930104; NPDES PA0212415) Merrill Strip has three mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001 and 003-004 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D42. Waste load allocation PA0212415			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	2.5	0.05	1.04
Mn	1.7	0.05	0.71
003			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	2.5	0.05	1.04
Mn	1.7	0.05	0.71
004			
Al	0.75	0.05	0.31
Fe	2.5	0.05	1.04
Mn	1.7	0.05	0.71

Waste Load Allocation – Future Industries, Inc. Bitner Mine (SMP56990103)

Future Industries, Inc. (SMP56990103; NPDES PA0235172) Bitner Mine has five mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-005 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for this discharge.

Table D43. Waste load allocation PA0235172			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	2.0	0.09	1.50
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
002			
Al	1.0	0.09	0.75
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
003			
Al	1.0	0.09	0.75
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
004			
Al	2.0	0.09	1.50
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
005			
Al	2.0	0.09	1.50
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50

Waste Load Allocation – Alverda Enterprises, Inc. Knepper-Coleman Operation (SMP56020105)

Alverda Enterprises, Inc. (SMP56020105; NPDES PA0249262) Knepper-Coleman Operation has three mine drainage treatment facilities requiring treatment. Outfalls 001-003 are discharges from treatment facilities. The following table shows the waste load allocation for these discharges.

Table D44. Waste load allocation PA0249262			
Parameter	Allowable Conc. (mg/L)	Average Flow (MGD)	Allowable Load (lbs/day)
001			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
002			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50
003			
Al	0.75	0.09	0.56
Fe	3.0	0.09	2.25
Mn	2.0	0.09	1.50

TMDL calculations- BUFF1- Buffalo Creek at mouth

The TMDL for sample point BUFF1 consists of a load allocation to all of the area between BUFF2/3/6/7 and BUFF1 shown in Attachment A. The load allocation for this segment of Buffalo Creek was computed using water-quality sample data collected at point BUFF1. The average flow, measured at the sampling point BUFF1 (35.52 MGD), is used for these computations.

Sample data at point BUFF1 shows that this segment has a pH ranging between 7.3 and 7.7; pH will not be addressed because water quality standards are being met. Table D45 shows the measured and allowable concentrations and loads at BUFF2. Table D46 shows the percent reductions for aluminum, iron, manganese and acidity.

Table D45		Measured		Allowable	
		Concentration	Load	Concentration	Load
		mg/L	lbs/day	mg/L	lbs/day
	Aluminum	0.62	184.15	0.34	99.44
	Iron	0.55	164.24	0.55	164.24
	Manganese	0.70	205.96	0.70	205.96
	Acidity	-12.68	-3756.49	-12.68	-3756.49
	Alkalinity	37.04	10973.23		

The measured and allowable loading for point BUFF1 for aluminum was computed using water-quality sample data collected at the point. This was based on the sample data for the point and did not account for any loads already specified from upstream sources. The additional load from points BUFF1 shows the total load that was permitted from upstream sources. This value was added to the difference in existing loads between points BUFF2/3/6/7 and BUFF1 to determine a total load tracked for the segment of stream between BUFF1 and BUFF2/3/6/7. This load will be compared to the allowable load to determine if further reductions are needed to meet the calculated TMDL at BUFF1.

Table D46. Allocations BUFF1	
BUFF1	Al (Lbs/day)
Existing Load @ BUFF1	184.15
Difference in measured loads between the loads that enter and existing BUFF1	121.85
Additional load tracked from above samples	55.25
Total load tracked between BUFF2/3/6/7 and BUFF1	177.10
Allowable Load @ BUFF1	99.44
Load Reduction @ BUFF1	77.66
% Reduction required at BUFF1	44%

Margin of Safety

For this study the margin of safety is applied implicitly. A MOS is implicit because the allowable concentrations and loadings were simulated using Monte Carlo techniques and employing the @Risk software. Other margins of safety used for this TMDL analysis include the following:

- An additional MOS is provided because that the calculations were done with a daily Fe average instead of the 30-day average.

Seasonal Variation

Seasonal variation is implicitly accounted for in these TMDLs because the data used represents all seasons.

Critical Conditions

The reductions specified in this TMDL apply at all flow conditions. A critical flow condition could not be identified from the data used for this analysis.

Attachment E

**Excerpts Justifying Changes Between the 1996, 1998, and 2002
Section 303(d) Lists and Integrated Report/List (2004, 2006)**

The following are excerpts from the Pennsylvania DEP Section 303(d) narratives that justify changes in listings between the 1996, 1998, 2002, 2004 and 2006 303(d) Lists and Integrated Report/List (2006). The Section 303(d) listing process has undergone an evolution in Pennsylvania since the development of the 1996 list.

In the 1996 Section 303(d) narrative, strategies were outlined for changes to the listing process. Suggestions included, but were not limited to, a migration to a Global Information System (GIS), improved monitoring and assessment, and greater public input.

The migration to a GIS was implemented prior to the development of the 1998 Section 303(d) list. As a result of additional sampling and the migration to the GIS some of the information appearing on the 1996 list differed from the 1998 list. Most common changes included:

1. mileage differences due to recalculation of segment length by the GIS;
2. slight changes in source(s)/cause(s) due to new EPA codes;
3. changes to source(s)/cause(s), and/or miles due to revised assessments;
4. corrections of misnamed streams or streams placed in inappropriate SWP subbasins; and
5. unnamed tributaries no longer identified as such and placed under the named watershed listing.

Prior to 1998, segment lengths were computed using a map wheel and calculator. The segment lengths listed on the 1998 Section 303(d) list were calculated automatically by the GIS (ArcInfo) using a constant projection and map units (meters) for each watershed. Segment lengths originally calculated by using a map wheel and those calculated by the GIS did not always match closely. This was the case even when physical identifiers (e.g., tributary confluence and road crossings) matching the original segment descriptions were used to define segments on digital quad maps. This occurred to some extent with all segments, but was most noticeable in segments with the greatest potential for human errors using a map wheel for calculating the original segment lengths (e.g., long stream segments or entire basins).

Migration to National Hydrography Data (NHD)

New to the 2006 report is use of the 1/24,000 National Hydrography Data (NHD) streams GIS layer. Up until 2006 the Department relied upon its own internally developed stream layer. Subsequently, the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) developed 1/24,000 NHD streams layer for the Commonwealth based upon national geodatabase standards. In 2005, DEP contracted with USGS to add missing streams and correct any errors in the NHD. A GIS contractor transferred the old DEP stream assessment information to the improved NHD and the old DEP streams layer was archived. Overall, this marked an improvement in the quality of the streams layer and made the stream assessment data compatible with national standards but it necessitated a change in the Integrated Listing format. The NHD is not attributed with the old DEP five digit stream codes so segments can no longer be listed by stream code but rather only by stream name or a fixed combination of NHD fields known as reachcode and ComID. The NHD is aggregated by Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) watersheds so HUCs rather than the old State Water Plan (SWP) watersheds are now used to group streams together. The map in

Appendix E illustrates the relationship between the old SWP and new HUC watershed delineations. A more basic change was the shift in data management philosophy from one of “dynamic segmentation” to “fixed segments”. The dynamic segmentation records were proving too difficult to manage from an historical tracking perspective. The fixed segment methods will remedy that problem. The stream assessment data management has gone through many changes over the years as system requirements and software changed. It is hoped that with the shift to the NHD and OIT’s (Office of Information Technology) fulltime staff to manage and maintain SLIMS the systems and formats will now remain stable over many Integrated Listing cycles.

Attachment F

Water Quality Data Used In TMDL Calculations

Point	Date	Flow, MGD	pH	Alkalinity	Acidity	Fe	Mn	Al	TSS
1	10/30/2007	6.44	7.7	56.2	-13.8	0.379	0.533	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
1	12/19/2007	32.15	7.3	26.4	-13	0.557	0.788	0.724	4
1	3/27/2008	29.99	7.4	32.6	-18	0.478	0.758	0.675	<u>1.5</u>
1	4/11/2008	18.98	7.6	40.2	-10.2	0.398	0.684	0.564	16
1	5/22/2008	90.05	7.3	29.8	-8.4	0.96	0.713	0.895	<u>10</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>35.52</i>	<i>7.46</i>	<i>37.04</i>	<i>-12.68</i>	<i>0.55</i>	<i>0.70</i>	<i>0.62</i>	<i>6.60</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>32.15</i>	<i>0.18</i>	<i>11.86</i>	<i>3.68</i>	<i>0.24</i>	<i>0.10</i>	<i>0.24</i>	<i>6.30</i>
2	10/30/2007	0.26	5.8	8	31.6	0.733	0.319	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
2	12/19/2007	1.94	5.4	7	11.4	0.472	0.286	0.68	<u>1.5</u>
2	3/27/2008	2.17	6.1	8.4	8	0.663	0.321	0.875	8
2	4/11/2008	1.73	5.8	8.4	7.6	0.695	0.271	0.595	16
2	5/22/2008	8.92	6.5	10.2	7.8	0.484	0.197	0.728	12
	<i>Average</i>	<i>3.00</i>	<i>5.92</i>	<i>8.40</i>	<i>13.28</i>	<i>0.61</i>	<i>0.28</i>	<i>0.63</i>	<i>7.80</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>3.39</i>	<i>0.41</i>	<i>1.16</i>	<i>10.36</i>	<i>0.12</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.23</i>	<i>6.41</i>
3	10/30/2007	0.67	7.4	36	7	<u>0.15</u>	0.157	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
3	12/19/2007	5.16	7.2	17.2	-0.4	<u>0.15</u>	0.664	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
3	3/27/2008	4.64	7	17.4	-2	0.553	0.636	0.54	<u>1.5</u>
3	4/11/2008	3.23	5.8	8.4	-6.8	<u>0.15</u>	0.332	<u>0.25</u>	10
3	5/22/2008	16.063	7.1	18.2	3	0.332	0.425	<u>0.25</u>	<u>6</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>5.95</i>	<i>6.90</i>	<i>19.44</i>	<i>0.16</i>	<i>0.27</i>	<i>0.44</i>	<i>0.31</i>	<i>4.10</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>5.91</i>	<i>0.63</i>	<i>10.09</i>	<i>5.20</i>	<i>0.18</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>0.13</i>	<i>3.83</i>
4	10/30/2007	0.006	6.9	14	27.4	0.627	0.079	<u>0.25</u>	16
4	12/19/2007	0.35	6.7	10.6	3.4	<u>0.15</u>	0.055	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
4	3/27/2008	0.51	6.6	10.8	5.2	1.172	0.111	1.535	<u>1.5</u>
4	4/11/2008	0.18	6.95	15.2	-2.9	<u>0.15</u>	0.044	<u>0.25</u>	13
4	5/22/2008	1.12	6.8	12.8	4.6	0.332	0.07	<u>0.25</u>	<u>10</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>6.79</i>	<i>12.68</i>	<i>7.54</i>	<i>0.49</i>	<i>0.07</i>	<i>0.51</i>	<i>8.40</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>0.14</i>	<i>2.00</i>	<i>11.56</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>0.03</i>	<i>0.57</i>	<i>6.65</i>
5	10/30/2007	0.11	4.7	6.6	32.6	<u>0.15</u>	0.439	1.63	<u>1.5</u>
5	12/19/2007	0.35	5.1	6.4	10.6	<u>0.15</u>	0.182	0.961	<u>1.5</u>
5	3/27/2008	0.51	4.9	6.6	13.4	<u>0.15</u>	0.183	1.072	<u>1.5</u>
5	4/11/2008	1.29	4.8	7	11.8	<u>0.15</u>	0.225	1.194	8
5	5/22/2008	1.11	5.1	7.2	13	<u>0.15</u>	0.138	0.786	<u>2.5</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>0.67</i>	<i>4.92</i>	<i>6.76</i>	<i>16.28</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.23</i>	<i>1.13</i>	<i>3.00</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>0.50</i>	<i>0.18</i>	<i>0.33</i>	<i>9.19</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.12</i>	<i>0.32</i>	<i>2.83</i>

6	10/30/2007	0.74	7.8	59	-27.2	<u>0.15</u>	<u>0.025</u>	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
6	12/19/2007	5.35	7.3	23.2	-12.8	<u>0.15</u>	0.24	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
6	3/27/2008	3.16	7.5	27.6	-13.4	0.385	0.224	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
6	4/11/2008	3.87	7.6	29	-11	<u>0.15</u>	0.121	<u>0.25</u>	12
6	5/22/2008	0.784	7.3	22	3.6	0.312	0.288	<u>0.25</u>	<u>6</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>2.78</i>	<i>7.50</i>	<i>32.16</i>	<i>-12.16</i>	<i>0.23</i>	<i>0.18</i>	<i>0.25</i>	<i>4.50</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>2.01</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>15.29</i>	<i>10.93</i>	<i>0.11</i>	<i>0.11</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>4.62</i>
7	10/31/2007	1.52	7.5	85.4	-47	0.484	0.469	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
7	12/20/2007	12.198	7.4	43.4	-29.4	0.315	0.347	<u>0.25</u>	4
7	3/27/2008	3.16	7.6	58.6	-40.8	1.968	0.657	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
7	4/11/2008	6.55	7.6	71	-53.6	0.53	0.76	<u>0.25</u>	12
7	5/22/2008	37.822	7.5	46	-22	0.338	0.303	<u>0.25</u>	<u>6</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>12.25</i>	<i>7.52</i>	<i>60.88</i>	<i>-38.56</i>	<i>0.73</i>	<i>0.51</i>	<i>0.25</i>	<i>5.00</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>14.87</i>	<i>0.08</i>	<i>17.58</i>	<i>12.85</i>	<i>0.70</i>	<i>0.20</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>4.34</i>
9	10/31/2007	0.181	6.5	18.8	29.4	4.17	3.33	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
9	12/20/2007	8.349	6.8	16.2	0.6	2.64	0.646	<u>0.25</u>	4
9	3/27/2008	6.932	6.9	21.2	0	2.65	0.971	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
9	4/11/2008	4.461	7.1	35.6	-19	2.379	1.086	<u>0.25</u>	14
9	5/22/2008	25.89	6.9	20.2	9.4	1.337	0.679	<u>0.25</u>	<u>2.5</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>9.16</i>	<i>6.84</i>	<i>22.40</i>	<i>4.08</i>	<i>2.64</i>	<i>1.34</i>	<i>0.25</i>	<i>4.70</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>9.85</i>	<i>0.22</i>	<i>7.61</i>	<i>17.54</i>	<i>1.01</i>	<i>1.13</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>5.30</i>
10	10/31/2007	0.052	5.3	7	18	<u>0.15</u>	0.215	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
10	12/20/2007	2.47	4.6	6.4	9	<u>0.15</u>	0.152	0.818	<u>1.5</u>
10	3/27/2008	0.86	4.7	6.8	13	<u>0.15</u>	0.131	0.754	<u>1.5</u>
10	4/11/2008	0.77	4.8	6.8	9.2	<u>0.15</u>	0.122	0.555	8
10	5/22/2008	7.63	4.7	6.2	94.8	<u>0.15</u>	0.131	0.703	<u>2.5</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>2.36</i>	<i>4.82</i>	<i>6.64</i>	<i>28.80</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.62</i>	<i>3.00</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>3.08</i>	<i>0.28</i>	<i>0.33</i>	<i>37.08</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.04</i>	<i>0.23</i>	<i>2.83</i>
11	10/31/2007	0.06	7.4	35.4	5.2	<u>0.15</u>	<u>0.025</u>	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
11	12/20/2007	2.77	7.1	16.2	-1.8	<u>0.15</u>	0.087	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
11	3/27/2008	2.3	7.3	18.4	-3	<u>0.15</u>	0.091	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
11	4/11/2008	1.48							
11	5/22/2008	8.59	7	15.4	7.4	<u>0.15</u>	0.133	<u>0.25</u>	<u>2.5</u>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>3.04</i>	<i>7.27</i>	<i>23.33</i>	<i>0.13</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.07</i>	<i>0.25</i>	<i>1.50</i>
	<i>StDev</i>	<i>3.27</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>10.51</i>	<i>4.43</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.04</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
12	10/30/2007	0.1	7.4	35.6	-13.4	<u>0.15</u>	1.02	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.5</u>
12	12/19/2007	5.35	6.8	12	3.4	<u>0.15</u>	1.56	1.34	6
12	3/27/2008	2.18	6.8	14.6	0.6	0.466	1.354	1.862	4
12	4/11/2008	1.5	7.2	19.8	-7	<u>0.15</u>	1.208	0.931	16

12	5/22/2008	7.11	<u>7</u>	<u>14</u>	6.8	0.323	0.77	0.855	8
	<i>Average</i>	3.25	<u>7.04</u>	<u>19.20</u>	-1.92	0.25	1.18	1.05	<u>7.10</u>
	<i>StDev</i>	2.89	<u>0.26</u>	<u>9.61</u>	8.19	0.14	0.30	0.60	5.53

Underlined values are included at half the detection limit.
All concentrations are given in units of milligrams per liter.

Attachment G

TMDLs and NPDES Permitting Coordination

NPDES permitting is unavoidably linked to TMDLs through waste load allocations and their translation, through the permitting program, to effluent limits. Primary responsibility for NPDES permitting rests with the District Mining Offices (for mining NPDES permits) and the Regional Offices (for industrial NPDES permits). Therefore, the DMOs and Regions will maintain tracking mechanisms of available waste load allocations, etc. in their respective offices. The TMDL program will assist in this effort. However, the primary role of the TMDL program is TMDL development and revision/amendment (the necessity for which is as defined in the Future Modifications section) at the request of the respective office. All efforts will be made to coordinate public notice periods for TMDL revisions and permit renewals/reissuances.

Load Tracking Mechanisms

The Department has developed tracking mechanisms that will allow for accounting of pollution loads in TMDL watersheds. This will allow permit writers to have information on how allocations have been distributed throughout the watershed in the watershed of interest while making permitting decisions. These tracking mechanisms will allow the Department to make minor changes in WLAs without the need for EPA to review and approve a revised TMDL. Tracking will also allow for the evaluation of loads at downstream points throughout a watershed to ensure no downstream impairments will result from the addition, modification or movement of a permit.

Options for Permittees in TMDL Watersheds

The Department is working to develop options for mining permits in watersheds with approved TMDLs.

Options identified

- Build excess WLA into the TMDL for anticipated future mining. This could then be used for a new permit. Permittee must show that there has been actual load reduction in the amount of the proposed permit or must include a schedule to guarantee the reductions using current data referenced to the TMDL prior to permit issuance.
- Use WLA that is freed up from another permit in the watershed when that site is reclaimed. If no permits have been recently reclaimed, it may be necessary to delay permit issuance until additional WLA becomes available.
- Re-allocate the WLA(s) of existing permits. WLAs could be reallocated based on actual flows (as opposed to design flows) or smaller than approved pit/spoil areas (as opposed to default areas). The "freed-up" WLA could be applied to the new permit. This option would require the simultaneous amendment of the permits involved in the reallocation.
- Non-discharge alternative.

Other possible options

The following two options have also been identified for use in TMDL watersheds. However, before recommendation for use as viable implementation options, a thorough regulatory (both state and federal) review must be completed. These options should not be implemented until the

completion of the regulatory review and development of any applicable administrative mechanisms.

- Issue the permit with in-stream water quality criteria values as the effluent limits. The in-stream criteria value would represent the monthly average, with the other limits adjusted accordingly (e.g., for Fe, the limits would be 1.5 mg/L monthly average, 3.0 mg/L daily average and 4.0 instantaneous max mg/L).
- The applicant would agree to treat an existing source (point or non-point) where there is no responsible party and receive a WLA based on a portion of the load reduction to be achieved. The result of using these types of offsets in permitting is a net improvement in long-term water quality through the reclamation or treatment of an abandoned source.

Attachment H

Comment and Response

No public comments were received on the Buffalo Creek Watershed TMDL.