



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)

February 19, 2002

TO: Internal File

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

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

RE: 2001 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Nevada Electric Investment Co.,  
Wellington Prep Plant, C/007/012-WQ01-4

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, was only a seep and did not produce enough water for a sample. Field parameters were the only parameters collected.

A total of 4 samples (of a possible 18 samples) analyzed had ion balance differences greater than 5 percent; all were less than 6 percent. The Field Specific Conductivity values for Wells GW-7, GW-9, GW-9B, GW-10, GW-12, and GW-14 were all suspiciously low. The field personnel questioned the values, and re-calibrated the probe at all wells. The probe will be double-checked again prior to the next sampling event. The values will remain as reported.

No other irregularities were found in the fourth quarter data.

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

1<sup>st</sup> month, YES [ x ] NO [ ]  
2<sup>nd</sup> month, YES [ x ] NO [ ]  
3<sup>rd</sup> 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 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring data.