

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

July 2, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DH*

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist *DS*

RE: 2004 First Quarter Water Monitoring, Energy West Mining Company, Trail Mountain Mine, C/015/0009-WQ04-1, Task ID # 1870

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [X] 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 [X] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

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

TM-3: zero water pressure was reported. Water level in this piezometer has been recovering since Trail Mountain Mine operations ceased. A well cap and pressure gauge were installed August 2003 because water was approaching the top of the casing, but the gauge has not reported any pressure since installation and may not be functioning. The Permittee has previously stated that the well would be opened in spring 2004 to see why the gauge isn't reporting a rise in pressure.

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:

DMRs were submitted in electronic format (Adobe). DMR data were submitted to the DOGM database as operational parameters, not as DMR parameters.

There was no discharge from either UPDES point during the first 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 first 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?

TM-3: the Permittee needs to make sure the gauge is functioning. The Permittee has previously stated that the well would be opened in spring 2004 to see why the gauge isn't reporting a rise in pressure.