

April 15, 2003

TO: Internal File  
THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor  
FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist III  
RE: 2002 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Canyon Fuel Company, LLC, Soldier Canyon Mine, C/007/018-WQ02-4

- 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**

A renewal submittal is due 10/03/01; the renewal is 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 X NO  
*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

All eleven (11) water-monitoring sites were accessed during the 4th quarter. Spring sites 23, 24 and Stream site G-10 consistently have 'No flow'. A total of four (4) samples were sent for lab analysis, with three of four showing less than 5 percent difference in ionic balance. In the last two quarters the lab has done an acceptable job in this analysis.

Weekly flow monitoring of selected sites was conducted from approximately April through August 2002. The weekly monitoring was initiated because snowpack was less than 70 percent of normal on March 1, 2002 (an MRP requirement). The information was not submitted until this quarter. A total of six (6) sites were outlined to be sampled however, only four (4) sites showed flow. The attached graph illustrates that the peak flows (likely with meteoric influence) were observed in late April and quickly established an apparent baseline flow from May through August. Springs 5 and 10 leveled out at 0.5 gpm and 0.25 gpm, respectively. Streams G-6 and G-7 leveled out at approximately 1.5 gpm and 3.0 gpm, respectively. These extremely low flows are likely influenced by the seasonally dry conditions that have been encountered over the last several years. It will be interesting to observe how these sites recover in the future. Another weekly monitoring sequence is required when snowpack is 110 percent of normal.

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

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

Streams G-5 and G-6 had Specific Conductivity values approximately double what has been seen over the last four and five years, respectively. Similarly, the Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) values at G-5 and G-6 were approximately double and 1/3 high, respectively for the same time periods. This analysis will continue to be monitored in the future.

**5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?**

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

Beginning the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 2002, all future UPDES information will be submitted electronically to the Division.

**6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?** YES  NO

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

No Discharge was recorded during the reporting period.

**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 02-4 (4th) quarter 2002.