

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

May 25, 2007

JK

TO: Internal File

THRU: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor DWH

FROM: David Darby, Senior Environmental Scientist 

RE: 2006 2nd Quarter Water Monitoring, Hiawatha Coal Company (HCC), Hiawatha Mine, C/007/0011-WQ06-2, Task ID #2655

Information for this report was evaluated from file 0:\007011.hia\Water Quality\Datacheck2005(3)-2007(1).xls. Hiawatha Coal Company has supplied a schedule for water monitoring, Table 7-14, and parameter reporting, Table 7-17, in the MRP, updated on June 6, 2003.

The Hiawatha mine is considered to be in the operational phase. Coal fines are being extracted from the #1 tailings ponds and trucked to Bear Canyon where the fines are blended with the mined coal. There is currently no underground mining taking place at the Hiawatha Mine

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

Springs HCC monitors six springs at the minesite, SP-2, SP-3, SP-3, SP-11, SP-12 and SP-13. Operational sampling is established in the MRP as two times per year, for spring sites, in June and October. Samples are analyzed for parameters identified in Table 7-12.

All spring sites were monitored according schedule.

Streams HCC currently monitors field parameters of streams on a monthly basis from April through October, (Table 7-17). Water Quality samples are collected and analyzed in April and September. Samples are analyzed for parameters identified in Table 7-16.

All streams sites were monitored according to schedule.

UPDES There are ten active UPDES sites at the Hiawatha Mine used to establish discharge quality. A permit amendment was submitted by HCC to add the eight sediment pond UPDES sites back into the permit area in March 2005. HCC started monitoring in January 2004. The UPDES sites were part of the mining permit in the past, but were removed in August 1998 after the U.S. EPA notified HCC it would no longer like to receive copies of the discharge monitoring reports (DMR's). There has been no activity or discharges from the ponds, since they were built for total containment. The operator now has committed to monitor UPDES sites monthly according to Table 7-17.

Pond No.	Location
D001	Mohrland Portal
D002	Overflow at Hiawatha
D003	Upper Coal Storage Yard
D004	North of Slurry Pond No. 1
D005	East of Slurry Pond No. 4
D006	North East of Slurry Pond No. 5
D007	South East of Slurry Pond No. 5
D008	Middle Fork Mine Yard
D009	South Fork Mine Yard
D011	South Fork Truck Loading Facility

The operator monitored all UPDES sites and submitted all 2nd quarter data/information. The only discharges were at sites D001 and D002.

Wells YES [] NO [] N/A, No wells on site.

2. Were all required parameters reported for each site?

Springs YES [X] NO []

Streams YES [X] NO []

UPDES YES [X] NO []

Wells YES [] NO [] N/A

3. Were irregularities found in the data?

Springs YES [] NO [X].

Streams YES NO

Some of the stream data (pH and Sp. Conductance) does not correlate to standards or data trends. The data has been marked and sent to the operator. The operator must check the data and resubmit it to the Division. The Division will update the database.

Questionable Data		pH	Sp. Cond.
ST-1	04-19-06	6.9	
	05-30-06	827	368
ST-2	05-30-06	81.7	
ST-4	06-27-06	589	8.9

UPDES YES NO

Some of the UPDES data (pH and Sp. Conductance) does not correlate to standards or data trends. The data has been marked and sent to the operator. The operator must check the data and resubmit it to the Division. The Division will update the database.

Questionable Data		pH	Sp. Cond.
001	04-20-06	69.0	
002	06-27-06		1.0
	04-20-06	54.6	

Wells YES NO N/A

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

Resampling due date July 2009

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

It has been observed this year that the monitoring schedule, which changed in June 6, 2003, has allowed the operator to avoid monitoring the higher spring flow by establishing the monitoring in the month of April. The previous plan proposed monitoring in April or May. It seems that, if there is snow on the ground during that time. Some of the surface sites were reported as zero flow during April 2006, but were reported as having flows in subsequent months, however no water quality sampling took place until October. Although the Operator met the monitoring requirements outlined in the MRP, the intent of seasonal monitoring is

circumvented. It looks like this was an oversight when the new plan was approved and may need to be corrected.

Does the Mine Operator need to submit more information to fulfill this quarter's monitoring requirements? Yes No

The Operator needs to make corrections of the inconsistent data.

6. Follow-up from last quarter, if necessary.

Did the Mine Operator submit all the missing and/or irregular data (datum)?

This report was delayed to facilitate the permit review process. The missing and irregular data will be tracked to ensure and the database is updated.

No