0002

#3381

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

January 14, 2010

TO: Internal File

THRU: James D. Smith, Permit Supervisor 01/20/10

FROM: Kevin Lundmark, Environmental Scientist II

SUBJECT: 2009 3rd Quarter Water Monitoring, Mountain Coal Company, Gordon Creek 2, 7, & 8 Mine, C/007/0016, WQ09-3, Task ID 3381

The Gordon Creek 2, 7, & 8 Mine has been reclaimed and received Phase II bond release on all but 1.63 acres on March 7, 2007. The 1.63 acres contained a three-cell sediment pond which was reclaimed in October 2007. Water monitoring requirements for the period after Phase II bond release until final bond release are described in the MRP on page 7-56 and in Tables 7-17 and 7-18.

This report was prepared from monitoring data queried from the UDOGM database. The data that support this report were collected and submitted to the database by the Permittee. The data were downloaded into file O:\007016.GC2\Water Quality\Spreadsheets\GC2_13Jan2010.xls for this review.

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES ☒ NO ☐

The Permittee is not required to monitor any springs or wells at the Gordon Creek 2, 7, & 8 Mine. Monitoring for UPDES discharges is no longer required as the sediment ponds and mine portals have been reclaimed.

Streams –

The Permittee is required to monitor one intermittent stream (2-2-W), and three ephemeral stream sites (2-7-W, 2-8-W, 2-9-W) quarterly for flow, field measurements and laboratory parameters as outlined on Table 7-18 of the MRP.

Stream 2-2-W (North Fork Gordon Creek) was reported with a flow of 56 gpm; other stream sites were reported with no flow. The Permittee submitted 3rd quarter 2009 data for the site during 4th quarter 2009.

2. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES ☒ NO ☐

3. Were any irregularities found in the data? YES ☒ NO ☐

The results for site 2-2-W were elevated by greater than two standard deviations above average values for dissolved calcium, magnesium and potassium, hardness and total cations. The cation-anion balance for the sample was acceptable (2.6 percent difference). The temperature for site 2-2-W was also elevated, reportedly due to warm weather and low flow within the creek.

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

The MRP does not require a five-year re-sampling of baseline water data.

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

None