

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

October 6, 2005

TO: Internal File

THRU: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor

FROM: James D. Smith, Environmental Scientist

RE: 2005 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, PacifiCorp, Cottonwood/Wilberg, C/015/0019, Task ID # 2254

The Cottonwood/Wilberg Mine monitoring plan is described in Appendix A of Volume 9 of the MRP.

There are no springs monitored at this site.

The mine was sealed May 10, 2001, so in-mine monitoring sites TMA @ 32 and 2ndS XC-11 are no longer accessible.

The pond at the Cottonwood Fan Portal was reclaimed in 2002 and UPDES 22896-002 is no longer reported to DOGM or the Division of Water Quality.

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?

Streams	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Wells	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
UPDES	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

At UT0022896-001, sampling and monitoring were done twice in May: the technician erroneously thought the second time was for June. As a result, there was no monitoring during June. DWQ was informed of this error, and this site was then sampled and monitored twice in July. (A similar problem occurred at Deer Creek Mine.)

2. Were all required parameters reported for each site?

Streams	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Wells	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
UPDES	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

3. Were any irregularities found in the data?

Listed parameters were outside two standard deviations: “n” is the number of values used to calculate the standard deviation in the Division’s database. An asterisk (*) indicates this is not a parameter required by the MRP.

Streams	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	---	-----------------------------

CCC1 May: flow was over the capacity of the flume.
June: pH reported as 0 (zero),

GWR02 May: flow (n = 251)

GWR03 May: flow (n = 208)
June: K (n = 36)

Wells	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	---	-----------------------------

WCWR1 June: pH (n = 33)

UPDES	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	---	-----------------------------

001 May: bicarbonate (n = 11)

4. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

The next renewal submittal is due 03/06/09 for renewal on 07/06/09. Baseline analyses were performed in 2001 and will be repeated every 5 years, i.e., the next baseline analyses will be in 2006.

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

There is no further action recommended at this time.

- 6. Does the Mine Operator need to submit more information to fulfill this quarter's monitoring requirements?** YES NO
- 7. Follow-up from last quarter (1st Qtr 2005), if necessary.** YES NO
- 8. Did the Mine Operator respond adequately to queries about missing or irregular data?** YES NO

an
O:\015019.CWW\WATER QUALITY\JDSWQ2254.DOC