

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

February 4, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: David Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2002 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, Consolidation Coal Company, Emery Deep Mine, C/015/0015-WQ02-3, Task ID #259

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

Information for this report was evaluated from file; 0:\015015.eme\Water Quality\Datacheck2002.xls.

Missing samples:

Springs No spring data was reported for the 3rd quarter. Sampling should have been done.
Streams All sites were monitored for 3rd quarter.
Wells Sites R1-l, had no data reported for 3rd quarter.
UPDES Third quarter data was not submitted for some of the UPDES sites.

- 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 _____

Plan does not specify.

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

Springs No monitoring required.
Wells Missing parameters as identified in Section 1, also RDA-1, RDA-2, RDA-3, RDA-4, RDA-5, RDA-6 and SM1-2.
Streams As identified in Section 1.
UPDES As identified in Section 1, no data was reported for these sites.

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

Missing data as identified in Section 1. Flow for spring sites. Oil and Grease parameters were not reported for streams.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [] NO [X]
2nd month, YES [] NO [X]
3rd month, YES [] NO [X]
Identify sites and months not monitored:

Data was not submitted for sedimentation UPDES sites 002, 005, 006 and 008

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES [] NO [X]
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Missing data as identified in Section 1 and 5.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES [X] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

As identified in Sections 1.

Page 3
C/015/0015-WQ02-3
Task ID #259
February 4, 2004

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

I have sent a copy of the data file to Steve Demczak and James Byars so they know what data is missing and hopefully submit it to the database. The data that is missing in the data file is identified by red highlighted areas of the table where the data should be. The color chart on the bottom of each worksheet identify the problem data.

O:\015015.EME\Water Quality\dwdWQ02-3_259.doc