

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

December 30, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor 

FROM: David Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist 

RE: 2004 1st Quarter Water Monitoring, Hiawatha Coal Company, Hiawatha Mine, C/007/0011-WQ04-1, Task ID #1948

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [] NO [X]
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

Information for this report was evaluated from file 0:\007011.hia\Water Quality\Datacheck2004-1-2.xls. Hiawatha Coal Company has supplied a schedule for water monitoring and parameter reporting in the MRP. An update to the MRP on June 6, 2003 shows an updated monitoring plan on Table 7-14 and a schedule on Table 7-17.

Springs The Operator monitors Springs SP-2, SP-4, SP-5, SP-11, SP-12 and SP-13 two times per year for operational parameters, in June and October, or when access permits.

No first quarter monitoring required.

Streams HCC is required to monitor Stream Sites ST-1, ST-2, ST-2B, ST-3, ST-3A, ST-4, ST-4A, ST-4B, ST-5 on a monthly based during the months of April through October. Operational parameters will be assessed in April and September or subsequent months as access dictates. Field parameters will be measured in the other months.

No first quarter monitoring required.

UPDES There are two active UPDES sites at the Hiawatha Mine used to establish groundwater quality. The operator will monitor UPDES sites once a month according to Table 7-17.

Data was reported for each month of the quarter.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling due date _____

Plan does not specify.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

UPDES

Flow data was not reported in March for Site D002. The value of 60 mg/L was several times higher for February compared to other months.

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [X] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

See Sections 1 and 3.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [X] NO [X]

2nd month, YES [X] NO [X]

3rd month, YES [X] NO [X]

Identify sites and months not monitored:

See Section 1 and 3.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

See Sections 1 and 3.

Page 3

C/007/0011-WQ-4-1

Task ID #1948

December 30, 2004

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES NO
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

See comments in Sections 1 and 3.

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

A copy of the data file will be e-mailed to the Mine Operator and DOGM Mine Inspector identifying the missing and irregular data. Both the Operator and Mine Inspector should check to see if the missing data identified in Sections 1 and 3 are available to be entered into the database. If the data is available, the Mine Operator should submit it to the DOGM Inspector and Hydrologist, so it can be entered into the Coal Database. If the data is not available the Mine may be in violation of R645-301-731-200.

O:\007011.HIA\Water Quality\dwdWQ04-1_1948.doc