

August 26, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2003 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Energy West Mining Company, Trail Mountain Mine, C0150009-WQ03-2, Task ID #168

1. Were 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

Renewal submittal due 10/21/04, renewal due 02/21/05. Baseline analyses were performed in 1996, 2001 and will be repeated every 5 years, i.e., next baseline analyses will be in 2006.

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

TM-3 June: Water depth or level was not determined because, "Pressure valve was in pipe".

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES NO

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

SW-1 June: HCO₃ (n = 102), Ca (n = 19), Mg (n = 19), Na (n = 19), field conductivity (n = 112), lab conductivity (n = 86; not a required parameter), SO₄ (n = 117), total alkalinity (n = 98; not a required parameter), total anions (n = 70; not a required parameter), total cations (n = 70; not a required parameter), and TDS (n = 118) were outside the two standard deviation range;

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES NO
2nd month, YES NO
3rd month, YES NO

Identify sites and months not monitored:

Data were submitted electronically for all three months. DMRs have been submitted in electronic format (Adobe) for April and May but not yet for June – the DMRs for June are expected before the end of the third quarter.

There was no discharge from either UPDES point during the second quarter. The mine was sealed in June 2001 and there has been no reported discharge at UPDES UT23728-002 (the mine-water discharge into Cottonwood Creek) since May 2001.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES NO

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

There was no discharge from either UPDES point during the second quarter.

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?

Sulfate values at SW-2 have returned to within two standard deviations of the mean value (see the attached chart); however, sulfate is still elevated and the Permittee needs to identify the source of this increase in sulfate in the stream.

SW-2 Sulfate

