

# WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

---

January 7, 2005

TO: Internal File

THRU: Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2004 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, Energy West Mining Company, Deer Creek Mine, C/015/0018, Task ID #2019

**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 10/07/00, renewal due 2/07/01. Baseline analyses were performed in 1996 and 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 [X] NO [ ]  
*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

The following table shows which parameters were outside the two standard-deviation range during the third quarter of 2004. Most analyses were on samples collected in July. Many of these are the result of small sample sizes rather than extreme values.

Monitoring Site	Field specific conductivity	Ca	Field pH	Bicarbonate	Other
79-10	√	√		√	
79-15	√			√	
79-2	√	√		√	
79-28	√		√		
79-34	√	√			
79-35	√	√	√		
79-38	√	√			
80-41		√			
80-47	√	√		√	
80-48	√				
82-52	√	√	√		TDS
89-60	√			√	Mg
89-61				√	
89-65	√			√	
89-67				√	
Burnt Tree	√	√	√		
Elk Spring	√	√		√	
Sheba Spring			√		
Ted's Tub	√		√	√	
Rilda Canyon Meter 3				√	
JV-9				√	
MF-7				√	
MF-10				√	Cl
RR-5					Flow
RR-23A				√	Flow, water temp.
UJV-206				√	
RCF-1				√	
MFB				√	DO
UPDES 23604-001 July					TSS
Main N. Main E.				√	
CCCW-1S					Depth to water
DCWR-1				√	Cation-anion balance

**5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?**

1<sup>st</sup> month, YES  NO   
2<sup>nd</sup> month, YES  NO   
3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

At UT0023604-002 in August, SS was reported instead of TSS because a storm greater than the 10-yr/24-hr event occurred just prior to sampling.

**6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?**

YES  NO

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

DMR parameters that are not included in operational parameter lists in the MRP (floating solids, sanitary waste, and visible foam) are not reported to either Water Quality on the DMRs or to the Division in the electronic submittal.

**7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?**

YES  NO

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

UT0023604-001 July: TSS-30 Day Average, TSS-7 Day Average, TSS-Daily Max were outside the two standard deviation range for TSS (n = 183).

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

The numerous values of field specific conductance and pH outside the two standard-deviation range may indicate a systematic error in measurement or non-calibration of the meters: the Permittee may need to review field procedures and calibrate the meters.

The numerous Ca and bicarbonate exceedences may indicate systematic lab error: the Permittee needs to check the lab's QA/QC procedures.