

0020



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

cc: Steve Demczak
for follow-up OK

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 22, 2002

TO: Internal File
THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRH*
FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist *JDS*
RE: 2001 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Energy West Mining Company, Deer Creek Mine, C/015/018-WQ01-2

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

No springs are scheduled to be monitored during the 2nd quarter except NEWUA Meters 2 and 3 in Rilda Canyon. At Rilda Canyon meters 2 and 3, April flow is reported in the database, but flow for May and field and operational parameters for June were not reported.

Flow at HCC01 is measured daily by Utah Power and reported by PacifiCorp in the Annual Report.

The samples for Main North – Main East and TW-10 were lost in transit, so there are no lab analyses. The reason there are no field data is not clear.

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:

DCWR1: Boron and Selenium were not reported.

Monthly operational analyses at the two UPDES points did not include baseline parameters. (Oil and grease is reported in the DMRs rather than as an operational parameter, and analysis for oil and grease is done only if there is a visible sheen on the water.)

Baseline parameters were not reported for Rilda Canyon sites RCLF1, RCLF2, and RCF2.

DO probe not working so there are no DO values reported.

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

DCWR1: Cation – anion balance was off 18%; checked and confirmed by lab without explanation.

DCR01: flow (n = 70) during May was outside (high) the two standard deviation range.

DCR04: flow (n = 196) during May was outside (high) the two standard deviation range; nitrate (n = 2) was outside the two standard deviation range and is a new extreme value as the two previous non-sub-MRL analyses were 0.00 mg/L.

DCR06: flow (n = 186) during May was outside (high) the two standard deviation range.

MHC01: flow (n = 187) during May was outside (high) the two standard deviation range.

HCC02: nitrate (n = 1) is outside the two standard deviation range and is a new extreme value as the previous non-sub-MRL analysis was 0.00 mg/L.

HCC04: nitrate (n = 1) was outside the two standard deviation range and is a new extreme value as the previous non-sub-MRL analysis was 0.00 mg/L.

RFC1: flow (n = 128) during May and June was outside (high) the two standard deviation range.

RFC2: flow (n = 129) during May was outside (high) the two standard deviation range.

RFC3: flow (n = 131) during May was outside (high) the two standard deviation range; nitrate (n = 3) was a new maximum.

RCW4: flow (n = 132) during May was outside (high) the two standard deviation range according to the datasheet, but the value in the database is 1000 gpm lower and within the two standard deviation range; nitrate (n = 3) was a new maximum.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

Identify sites and months not monitored:

1 st month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
2 nd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
3 rd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

YES NO

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

YES NO

UT0023604-001 – April DMR average flow is above the reported maximum in the APPX database and outside two standard deviation range (n = 105).

UT0023604-001 – June DMR average flow (n = 105) and DMR minimum pH (n = 110) are outside two standard deviation range.

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

DMR TDS Quarter Average, a parameter required for UT0023604-002, needs to be added to the APPX database.

Numerous values were outside the two standard deviation range. Sample size is usually small, and none of the values are extreme. Recommended action is to watch for trends.

Flows in Rilda Canyon were high, but were below previous maximum values; the value for flow at DWR4 that is recorded in the database is lower than on the lab report and needs to be checked.

Flow data (monthly) and water quality data (quarterly) for NEWUA Meters #2 and #3 need to be submitted quarterly. Monthly flow data are in the Annual Report, but water-quality data from these two sites are not submitted consistently.