



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)

CC: Steve Demczak OK
for follow-up

April 5, 2002

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor DRH

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist JDS

RE: 2001 First Quarter Water Monitoring, Energy West Mining Company, Deer Creek Mine, C/015/018-WQ01-1

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

No springs are monitored during the 1st quarter.
Flow at HCC01 is measured daily by Utah Power and reported by PacifiCorp in the Annual Report;
RCF1, RCLF1, RCLF2, RCF2, MFA1, MFB2, DCR01, and MCH01 and well EM-47 were reported as either frozen, dry, or inaccessible for the entire quarter;
RCF3, NEWUA Meters 2 and 3, wells P-1, P-4, P-5, P-6, and P-7 were reported as inaccessible during February and March;
Quarterly operational water-quality data for HCC01, HCC02, HCC04, DCR06, RCW-4, DCWR1, TW-10, and Main North-Main East were not submitted by EDI;
The quarterly water-level for DCP1 was not submitted by EDI;
The no-access information for RCF3 for March was not submitted by EDI.

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

Renewal submittal due 10/07/00, renewal due 2/07/01. Baseline analyses were performed in 1996 and will be repeated every 5 years, i.e., next baseline analyses will be in 2001.

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

HCC01: dissolved Zn was not reported;
DCWR1: boron was not reported;
UPDES UT-0023604-001 and 002: monthly operational oil and grease, Total Settleable Solids, and baseline parameters were not reported;
TW-10 and Main North – Main East: field conductivity and field pH were not reported;

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

DCR04: nitrate (n = 2) was outside two standard deviation range;
HCC01: Na (n = 15), lab conductivity (not a required parameter; n = 69), and field DO (n = 76) were outside two standard deviation range;
HCC02: Na (n = 22), lab conductivity (not a required parameter; n = 69), and field DO (n = 75) were outside two standard deviation range;
HCC04: Na (n = 15) and lab conductivity (not a required parameter; n = 69) were outside two standard deviation range;
RCW4: Ca (n = 15) and lab conductivity (not a required parameter; n = 67) were outside two standard deviation range;
UPDES UT-0023604-001; for January, the HCO₃ value on the lab report does not match the value in the database;
UPDES UT-0023604-002; for January, the HCO₃ value in the database (n = 143) matches the value in the lab report, but the value was outside two standard deviation range
Main North – Main East: SO₄ (n = 32), lab conductivity (not a required parameter but field conductivity was not measured; n = 32), and total hardness (n = 32) were outside two standard deviation range.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?
Identify sites and months not monitored:

1 st month,	YES [X]	NO []
2 nd month,	YES [X]	NO []
3 rd month,	YES [X]	NO []

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

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES [X] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

UT0023604-002:

January DMR daily max total iron exceeded permit limitation. This was reported to Div of Water Quality;

February DMR daily max total iron was outside two standard deviation range and exceeded permit limitation;

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

Several parameters had values outside the two standard deviation range. For many of these, sample size is small, and none of the values were extreme. Recommended action is to watch for trends.

DO was outside two standard deviation range in several measurements for Huntington Creek. Recommended action is for operator to check calibration of DO meter with each use.