

April 7, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2002 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, Energy West Mining Company, Deer Creek Mine, C/015/018-WQ02-4

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

The Division has not received the following data for the fourth quarter of 2002:

	<u>October</u>	<u>November</u>	<u>December</u>
MHC01	Flow		
RCF3		Flow	
UPDES UT-23604-001	Operational		
EM-31	Level	Level	Level
EM-47	Level	Level	Level

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

- 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 2001 and will be repeated every 5 years, i.e., next baseline analyses will be in 2006.

**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:*

DCWR1: depth (n = 50) was outside the two standard deviation range; this appears to be a data-entry error;

HCC01: field pH: (n = 87) was outside the two standard deviation range;

HCC02: field pH: (n = 86) was outside the two standard deviation range;

HCC04: field pH: (n = 88) was outside the two standard deviation range;

NEWUA METER-2: Na (n = 14), field conductivity (n = 24), sulfate (n = 27), TDS (n = 27), and total anions (n = 14; not a required parameter) were outside the two standard deviation range;

NEWUA METER-3: field pH (n = 25), sulfate (n = 28), and TDS (n = 28) were outside the two standard deviation range;

RCF3: TDS (n = 40) was outside the two standard deviation range;

RCW4: field conductivity (n = 75), lab conductivity (n = 42; not a required parameter), sulfate (n = 42), and TDS (n = 42) were outside the two standard deviation range;

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

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

*Identify sites and months not monitored:*

The Division received no DMRs for the fourth quarter.

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

The Division received no DMRs for the fourth quarter.

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

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

The Division received no DMRs for the fourth quarter.

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

The reason incorrect depths are being entered at DCWR1 needs to be identified and corrected (three out of four quarters during 2002);

Fourth-quarter DMRs for the UPDES sites need to be submitted;

The specific conductivity and pH meters need to be checked for proper calibration;

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. None of the values are extreme. Recommended action is to watch for trends.