

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

March 17, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Dana Dean, P.E., Senior Reclamation Hydrologist

RE: 2003 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Canyon Fuel Company, Soldier Canyon Mine, C/007/0018-WQ03-4, Task ID# 1840

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

- 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

There is no commitment in the MRP to resample for baseline parameters.

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

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

Site G-5 had two parameters outside of two standard deviations from the mean. Dissolved Magnesium (63.6 mg/l) was 2.13 standard deviations greater than the mean of 42.34 mg/l. Sulfate (230 mg/l) was 2.98 standard deviations higher than the mean of 108.8 mg/l.

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"/>

All DMRs reported "no flow".

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES NO

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All DMRs reported "no flow".

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES NO

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

All DMRs reported "no flow".

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

No further actions are necessary at this time.