



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)

July 1, 2002

TO: Internal File

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

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

RE: 2001 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, PacifiCorp, Cottonwood / Wilberg Mine, C/015/019-WQ01-2

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

The mine was sealed May 10, 2001, so in-mine monitoring site 2ndS XC-11 was not Monitored. TMA @ 32 was monitored in April and May before the mine was sealed;

There was no discharge at UPDES UT23728-002 (the mine discharge), -003, -004, or -005 during the second quarter;

GRW01: no flow reported during quarter;

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 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 NO

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

GWR02: lab specific conductivity (not a required parameter, n = 40) was outside the two standard deviation range;

GWR03: Ca (n = 24) was outside (below MDL) the two standard deviation range;

TMA XC-32-33#3D: Mo (n = 1, 5 non-detects) was detected above the MDL; lab specific conductivity (not a required parameter, n = 30) was outside the two standard deviation range;

WCWR1: Mo (n = 3, 6 non-detects) was detected above the MDL – all three detectable Mo concentrations were measured in 2001;

UPDES 0022896-001A – April (monthly operational):): flow (n = 9), K (n = 7), Na (n = 7), sulfate (n = 7), total alkalinity (n = 7), TDS (n = 7), and total hardness (n = 7) were outside two standard deviations;

UPDES 0022896-001A - May (monthly operational):): flow (n = 9), K (n = 7), Na (n = 7), lab specific conductivity (not a required parameter, n = 7), sulfate (n = 7), total alkalinity (n = 7), TDS (n = 7), total iron (n = 1, 6 non-detects), and total hardness (n = 7) were outside two standard deviations;

UPDES 0022896-001A – June (monthly operational):):

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES NO

2nd month, YES NO

Identify sites and months not monitored:

3rd month, YES NO

UTG0022896-002, -003, -004, and 005: no discharge during quarter.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported? YES NO

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

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

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Page 3
C/015/019-WQ01-2
July 1, 2002

UTG0022896-001: DMR values are not in the database.

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. The MDL for Mo appears to have been lower than in the past, resulting in Mo having been detected at low concentrations..

\\O:\015019.CWWWATER QUALITY\WQ_01-2.DOC