

**WATER QUALITY
M E M O R A N D U M**
Utah Coal Regulatory Program

October 10, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Steve Fluke, Reclamation Hydrogeologist

RE: 2000, Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Canyon Fuel Company,
SUFCO Mine, C/041/0002

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [X] NO []

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

The MRP does not require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.

Resampling due date.

Not specified.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [X] NO []

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [X] NO []

Irregularities include:

Pines 403 - flow missing, low temperature (-0.5 °C), high D.O. (11.2 mg/l), and O/G detection (4 mg/l);

Pines 405 – flow missing, low temperature (-0.5 °C), and high D.O. (11.38 mg/l);

Pines 406b – low temperature (-0.5 °C) and high D.O. (11.5 mg/l);

Pines 100 – drop in measured flow from 67.3 gpm on 8/22/2003 (3rd quarter 2000) to 0.1 gpm on 11/14/2003; and

Pines 214 – low temperature (-0.4 °C) and conductivity (108 umhos/cm) although laboratory TDS measurement is normal at 114 mg/l;

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

| | | |
|---|-----------|--------|
| 4 th quarter, 1 st month, | YES [X] | NO [] |
| 2 nd month, | YES [X] | NO [] |
| 3 rd month, | YES [X] | NO [] |

All required UPDES sites were monitored.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES [X] NO []

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES [] NO [X]

Sediment pond discharge (UPDES site 002) 1st and 2nd months.

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

Review future data of sites with irregularities listed above to see if the irregularities are anomalous or the beginning of trends. The measured flow of spring site Pines 100 is likely a typo. Have this corrected in the database if this is the case.