

OGMCOAL - Wellington 4th Quarter 2011 Water Quality Report

From: April Abate
To: Patrick Collins
Date: 7/2/2012 4:39 PM
Subject: Wellington 4th Quarter 2011 Water Quality Report
CC: OGMCOAL@utah.gov
Attachments: 06122012.pdf; April Abate.vcf

Patrick,

Attached is your water quality report for Wellington.

Thanks,

April

April A. Abate

Environmental Scientist III

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

1594 W. North Temple, Suite 1210

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

T: 801.538.5214

M: 801.232.1339

#3977

α

WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

June 12, 2012

TO: Internal File

THRU: Steve Christensen, Permit Supervisor *SC*

FROM: April A. Abate, Environmental Scientist III *AAA 6/13/2012*

RE: 2011 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Nevada Electric Investment Corporation, Wellington Preparation Plant, C/007/0012, Task ID #3977

The Wellington Preparation Plant is currently in temporary cessation. No mining or coal processing activities currently take place there. Water-monitoring requirements are in Sections 7.23 and 7.31.2 through 7.31.22, and Tables 7.24-2 and 7.24-5 of the MRP.

1. On what date does the MRP require a five-year re-sampling of baseline water data.

Baseline parameters are collected in the year preceding permit renewal. The next scheduled permit renewal for the Wellington Preparation Plant is November 30, 2014.

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

Streams and Ponds YES NO

The Permittee is required to analyze samples from streams at SW-1, SW-2A, SW-3, and SW-4 and from ponds at SW-5, SW-6, SW-7, and SW-8 for the parameters in Table 7.24-5, and to measure flow only at SW-2. In addition, samples from SW-4 and SW-5 are to also be analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene, and naphthalene (BTEXN) and propylene glycol. Monitoring is done quarterly.

During the fourth quarter 2011, samples were collected from SW-1 and SW-2A. Flow only was measured from SW-2. None of the other monitoring locations reported flow. None of the pond samples reported any water during this monitoring period.

Wells YES NO

The Permittee is required to analyze samples quarterly from GW-1, GW-3, GW-4, GW-6, GW-7, GW-8, GW-9, GW-9B, GW-10, GW-12, GW-13, GW-14, GW-15A, GW-15B, GW-16, and GW-17 for the parameters in Table 7.24-2, and to measure depth only at GW-2.

GW-3 was reported as dry. GW-12 was sampled but reported as likely influenced by surface water.

UPDES YES NO

Six UPDES permitted outfalls at the Wellington Preparation Plant are monitored monthly: #UTG040010-003, 004, 005, 006, 007, and 008. None of the UPDES sites reported flow during the fourth quarter 2011.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site?

Streams and Ponds YES NO

Wells YES NO

UPDES YES NO

Not applicable

4. Were any irregularities found in the data?

Streams and Ponds YES NO

Wells YES NO

The following table summarizes the parameters that were outside of at least two standard deviations for this quarter:

Well	Parameter	Concentration in mg/L	Std Deviation	Mean mg/L
GW-1	Cl	104	2.22	74.04
GW-9B	D-Mg	504.37	2.06	674.9
GW-15	Cond (FLD)	7510	4.15	3836.7
	D-Mg	387.05	5.07	190.16
	D-Na	1068.1	5.32	389.95
	Cl	255	7.23	87.82
	SO4	3902	4.45	2099.63
	T-Alk	959	9.71	515.71
	T-Hardness	2792	3.16	1889.63
	L-SpCond	7110	4.61	4183.78

	TDS	7034	4.63	3812.51
	Bcrb CaCO3	959	7.70	513.17
	T-Ca T-Ani	Outside of 5%		
GW-15B	T-Alk	538	3.10	479.82
	Bcrb CaCO3	538	3.07	474.17
GW-17	SO4	77	2.04	351.21

*result reported in ug/L

Overall water quality in the reach of the Price River that runs through the permit area was generally good for 2011. Total iron was reported higher than 1.0 mg/L at the Farnham Diversion 3 of the 4 quarters this year. The following table averages significant water quality parameters for the four sampling quarters (reported in mg/L), except pH in units:

D.O.	TSS	O/G	D-B	D-Fe	D-Pb	D-Mn	D-Se	T-Fe	T-Mn	T-Se	T-B	D-Mg	T-Hardns	TDS	F-pH
8.81	300.13	<5	0.12	<.03	<.01	0.03	<.02	2.39	0.15	<20	0.14	51.08	460.75	818.75	8.45

UPDES

YES NO

Not Applicable. No discharges were reported from any of the UPDES monitoring locations.

5. Did the Permittee make a timely submittal of all data, including initially missing data, and satisfactorily explain irregular data? YES NO

6. Does the Mine Permittee need to submit more information to fulfill this quarter's monitoring requirements? YES NO

7. Follow-up from last quarter, if necessary.

None

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

The Permittee is in the process of developing an up-to-date Probable Hydrologic Consequence (PHC) document for the Wellington Mining and Reclamation Plan. During the midterm review, a PHC document was required as part of the submittal due on July 20, 2012.