



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210

PO Box 145801

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

(801) 538-5340 telephone

(801) 359-3940 fax

(801) 538-7223 TTY

www.nr.utah.gov

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Robert L. Morgan
Executive Director

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

July 23, 2002

TO: Internal File

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

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

RE: 2002 First Quarter Water Monitoring, Nevada Electric Investment Co.,
Wellington Prep Plant, C/007/012-WQ02-1

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 [] NO [x]

A total of 4 samples (of a possible 16 samples) analyzed had ion balance differences greater than 5 percent; all were less than 6 percent. The Field Specific Conductivity values noted as being suspiciously low last quarter were back within normal parameters this quarter.

No other irregularities were found in the first quarter data.

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 2002 First Quarter Water Monitoring data.