

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

April 8, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: David Darby, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2001 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Consolidation Coal Company, Emery Deep Mine, C/015/0015-WQ01-2, Task ID #1236

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\Datacheck2001-2&3.xls. Consol has supplied a schedule for water monitoring and parameter reporting in Tables VI-22 and VI-23.

Springs	Information is supplied for the quarter.
Streams	Second quarter data for Sites 1 is missing.
Wells	No water level data is reported for sites Bryant, EMRIA 2, Kemmer, Lewis U, SM1-1, SM1-2, SM1-3, SM1-4, T1 B, and USGS 1-2.
UPDES	There are 4 UPDES sites showing. All four do not show data for April and May. Sites 001 and 004 do not show data for June.

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 there is missing data for the SM1-2, SM1-4, Lewis and Kemmer Wells. Several of the wells do not show water level data, however it looks as if the real depth data was logged in under the 'Water Levels' column.
Streams. As identified in Section 1. Oil and Grease parameters were not reported.

Streams No data reported for Site 1A.

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

Missing data as identified in Section 1, also there are some well sites with questionable data, R1-L and TP-U may have data entered in the wrong parameter.

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:

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

Oil and grease was not reported for any of the sites

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

As identified in Sections 1, 4 and 6.

Page 3
C/15/0015-WQ01-2
Task ID #1236
April 8, 2004

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

I will sent a copy of the data file to Steve Demczak and Steve Behling, 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\dwdWQ01-2_1236.doc