



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)

December 11, 2000

TO: [REDACTED]

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

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist *JDS*

RE: 2000 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, PacifiCorp, Cottonwood / Wilberg Mine,
[REDACTED] Q00-2

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

GWR01: no flow;
GRW02: damp

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 3/06/04, renewal due 7/06/04. 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 [X] NO []
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

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

WMD01: In May sample, K is below two standard deviation range, but matches the

previous minimum;
GWR03: Mg is outside two standard deviation range;
WCWR1: cations and anions are not balanced, 16% difference;

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

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

Identify sites and months not monitored:

UTG0022896-002, -004, and 005: no discharge.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES [X] NO []

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

UTG0022896-001: intermittent discharge in March, no water-quality samples taken.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES [] NO [X]

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Flow estimated at UTG0022896-003 in January and March because of a broken meter.

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

No action necessary: several values were outside the two standard deviation range but this does not appear to be cause for concern.