



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Kathleen Clarke
Executive Director
Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
PO Box 145801
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-7223 (TDD)

April 11, 2002

TO: Internal File
THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRH*
FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist III *GA*
RE: 2001 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Canyon Fuel Company, LLC, Soldier Canyon Mine, C/007/018-WQ01-4

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

Well 6-1 has not been monitored due to blockage within the casing. It has not been sampled since 1997 and the Operator has committed to taking it out of the MRP sampling frequency during permit renewal.

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

Renewal submittal due 10/03/01, renewal due 02/03/02. No commitment to resample for baseline parameters preceding re-permitting has been found in the MRP .

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES NO
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

A total of three (3) of ten (10) sites were sampled during the quarter. The remaining seven (7) samples had no access on December 12, 2001. Streams G-5 and G-6 were analyzed in the lab; Spring 10 required field-parameters only.

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

Of ten total springs, wells, and stream seven (7) sites had no access. The only date shown to attempt accessing the sites was December 12, 2001. A trend has developed over the last few years to not attempt to sample these higher elevation sites. The permittee has been notified that attempts to access these sites must be made earlier in the quarter or violation may be warranted. No other irregularities were observed during the 01-4 (4th) quarter.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1 st month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
2 nd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
3 rd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES NO
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

No Discharge was recorded during the reporting period. The operator does not submit the DMR information electronically. They have been encouraged to do so in the future.

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

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

No further action is necessary for the 01-4 (4th) quarter 2001.