



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Kathleen Clarke
Executive Director
Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
PO Box 145801
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-7223 (TDD)

OK

February 19, 2002

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRH*

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist III *GA*

RE: 2001 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Nevada Electric Investment Co., Wellington Prep Plant, C/007/012-WQ01-2

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

Data was submitted for all surface-water, groundwater, and UPDES sites.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.
Renewal of the permit is December 10, 2004. The MRP commits to sampling baseline water parameters one year prior to the renewal date.

Resampling due date 12/10/04

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

At Well GW-13, only field parameters were collected. GW-13 has very slow recovery. When initially pumped, the well produces less than a liter of water; barely enough to collect field parameters. When allowing a day to recover, the well still does not produce any measurable water. GW-13 is located in a non-essential water monitoring area since the surface facilities no longer exist in the area. It is recommended that the site be removed from the Water Monitoring Plan.

All other parameters were reported at the remainder of the sites.

4. Were irregularities found in the data?

YES [x] NO []

Stream site SW-4, located on the Siaperal ditch, showed exceptionally good water quality for all the parameters collected. Parameters such as Specific Conductivity, Sulfate, TDS, and all major cations and anions were 15 to 25 percent of normal values.

A total of 12 samples (of a possible 18 samples) analyzed had ion balance differences greater than 5 percent, ranging from 5.69 percent to 9.62 percent. Field Specific Conductivities for samples collected on the West side of the property were originally input at approximately 10 percent of their true/anticipated values. It was determined the lab input a comma in values greater than 1,000 umohms, which corrupted the electronic file and eventually eliminated the digits greater than 999. The problem was identified and resolved.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [x] NO []
2nd month, YES [x] NO []
3rd month, YES [x] NO []

Sites 003 through 008 had documentation for a site visits every month.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [x] NO []

All sites were dry so no parameters were submitted

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES [] NO [x]

All sites were dry so no parameters were submitted

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

No further action is necessary for the 2001 Second Quarter Water Monitoring data. Deficiencies noted earlier have been addressed adequately.