



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

CC Bill Malencik

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)

July 3, 2000

TO: [Redacted]
THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRT*
FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist *JDS*
RE: 1999 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, West Ridge Resource Inc., West Ridge Mine, A [Redacted]

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

No flow at stream sites ST-4, ST-5, ST-6, ST-6a, and ST-7.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.
See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling Due Date

Commitment to samples every fifth year, beginning with the first mid-term review (p. 7-20): first mid-term due 10/01/01.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [X] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [X] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

TDS for well DH-86-2 is one order of magnitude smaller than the values recorded in the APPX database and does not check against specific conductivity. For several samples, values for various parameters, such as bicarbonate, alkalinity, specific conductivity, TDS, and sulfate, exceed previous high values recorded in APPX database by small amounts, and other parameters

are below previous lows by small amounts; however, the number of samples in the database is small.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [] NO [X]

2nd month, YES [] NO [X]

3rd month, YES [] NO [X]

Identify sites and months not monitored:

D001 - no reports received.

D002 - no reports received.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

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

Follow-up on TDS for well DH-86-2 for explanation of low value for TDS.

Locate DMRs.

sm

O:\007041.WR\Water Quality\WQ_99-4.wpd