



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)

April 16, 2001

TO: Internal File

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

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

RE: 2000 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Andalex Resources, Inc., Centennial Project, C/007/019-WQ00-4

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

Missing data was submitted April 12, 2001.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year re-sampling 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.*

During the year preceding each re-permitting action: one sample for baseline analysis at high and one at low flow for surface-monitoring sites, and one at low flow for ground-water monitoring sites. The next renewal submittal is due 09/04/2001, for renewal on 04/04/2002.

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

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

The ionic balance was out of equilibrium by 7% and the Total Suspended Solids (TSS) was 91 mg/l. Although TSS is not normally monitored for a groundwater well, the value is quite high. The high value possibly is indicative of a poorly developed well, a breach in the screen, or the purge rate during sampling is too long and taxing the aquifer.

The downward trending sulfate values at Well S18-1, noted during last quarter, appear to have stabilized at approximately 930 mg/l (considering the limited data set reviewed). The sulfate trends will continue to be monitored.

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

1<sup>st</sup> month, YES [ XX ] NO [ ]  
2<sup>nd</sup> month, YES [ XX ] NO [ ]  
3<sup>rd</sup> month, YES [ XX ] NO [ ]

**6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?**

YES [ XX ] NO [ ]

UT0040008 001 through 004 were the DMR sites that were reviewed; no discharge was reported at all sites.

**7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?**

YES [ ] NO [ XX ]

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 2000 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring data. Deficiencies noted earlier have been addressed adequately.