



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: Mike Saffita
for follow-up

July 5, 2002

TO: Internal File
THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *DRH*
FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist *JPS*
RE: 2001 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, CO-OP Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, C/015/025-WQ01-3

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

- No flow at BC-3 and BC-4;
- SDH-2: September data not reported;
- SDH-3: September data not reported;
- MW-114 and MW-115: data not in EDI database and paper records were not submitted;

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-2: water temperature (n = 131) and Ca (n = 32) were outside the two standard deviation range;

FC-1: dissolved oxygen (n = 6) was outside the two standard deviation range;

SBC-14: cation – anion difference was greater than 5 percent;

SBC-17: cation – anion difference was greater than 5 percent;

SMH-2: flow (n = 27) was outside the two standard deviation range;

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES [X] NO []

2nd month, YES [X] NO []

Identify sites and months not monitored:

3rd month, YES [X] NO []

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

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

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

UPDES UTG040006 –004 – August and September: 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 the MRP operational data do not appear significant and no further action is recommended other than watching for possible trends;

The permittee needs to submit September data for SDH-2 and SDH-3 and third quarter data for MW-114 and MW-115.

O:\015025.BCN\WATER QUALITY\JDSWQ_01-3.DOC