



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)

July 5, 2001

TO: [Redacted]
THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRH*
FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist *GA*
RE: 2001 First Quarter Water Monitoring, Canyon Fuel Company, Dugout Mine,
[Redacted] WO 01-1

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

Low-flow 2002 (third quarter)

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:

Of 20 sample location sites on the Monitoring Plan, 15 or 75 percent of the sites were submitted as 'No Access'. Springs 200, 203, 227, 259, 260, SC-100, SC-16, SC-65, SP-20, stream RC-1, and Wells GW-10-2, GW-11-2 have continually had problems with access during the 1st and 4th quarters. This will be discussed in future meetings with the permittee.

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.

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 actions, with the exception of questioning the Operator about why they have such difficulty in sampling during the 1st and 4th quarters. Either a more concerted effort needs to take place for sampling during those quarters, or an adjustment to the Monitoring Plan may be necessary.

Snotel data was submitted indicating the collection of high flow-low flow hydrograph data was not mandated during 2001.