



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

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
PO Box 145801
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
(801) 538-5340 telephone
(801) 359-3940 fax
(801) 538-7223 TTY
www.nr.utah.gov

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Robert L. Morgan
Executive Director
Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

CC: Pete

OK

July 5, 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, CO-OP Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, C/015/025-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:

MW-114 and MW-115: data not in EDI database and paper records were not submitted;

BC-2, DH-1A, SDH-2, and SDH-3: data not in EDI database but paper records were submitted;

No flow at BC-3;

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 07/02/00, renewal due 11/02/00. Baseline parameters are to be taken in August of year 5 prior to each permit renewal (Table 7.1-8). Baseline parameters were measured August 2000 and included with the Third Quarter 2000 data submittal.

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:

BC-1: flow (n = 152) was outside the two standard deviation range, cation – anion balance is greater than 5 percent;

BC-2: total iron (n = 98) was outside the two standard deviation range;

MH-1: flow (n = 18) was outside the two standard deviation range;

FC-1: flow (n = 11) was outside the two standard deviation range;

SBC-12: Mg (n = 10), lab specific conductivity (n = 10), sulfate (n = 15), total alkalinity (n = 10) were outside the two standard deviation range – none of these are a required parameter, field parameters only at this site;

SBC-13: flow (n = 21) was a new minimum;

SBC-17: field specific conductivity (n = 6), sulfate (n = 6), total anions and total cations (n = 6), TDS (n = 6), total hardness (n = 6), Ca (n = 6), K (n = 6), Na (n = 6), and Mg (n = 6) were outside (low) the two standard deviation range, and flow (n = 6) was outside (high) the two standard deviation range, which might account for the large number of low – or diluted – values for other parameters;

SMH-1: lab specific conductivity (n = 22) was outside the two standard deviation range, cation – anion balance is greater than 5 percent;

SMH-2: lab specific conductivity (n = 18) was outside the two standard deviation range;

SMH-3: lab specific conductivity (n = 19) was outside the two standard deviation range;

SMH-4: Ca (n = 17) and lab specific conductivity (n = 18) were outside the two standard deviation range, cation – anion balance is greater than 5 percent;

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:

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

No discharge for UPDES points 002, 003, 006, and 007.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data? YES NO
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

UPDES UTG040006 -004 - June: TDS daily max DMR in mg/L (n = 90) was outside the two standard deviation range;

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

Irregularities in data do not appear significant and no further action is recommended other than watching for possible trends;

The permittee needs to submit data for MW-114 and MW-115.