

May 9, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2002 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, CO-OP Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, C/015/025-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 MRP monitoring data for the fourth quarter of 2002:

	<u>October</u>	<u>November</u>	<u>December</u>
BC-1	Operational		
BC-2	Operational		
BC-3	Operational		
SBC-3	Operational		
SBC-9A	Operational		
SDH-2	Level		
SDH-3	Level		
MW-114	Level		
MW-115	Level		

“No access” was reported at piezometers SDH-2, SDH-3, MW-114, and MW-115 throughout 2002. These are normally accessible from the surface. NOV #NO3-40-1-1 was issued on February 21, 2003 for failure to monitor these piezometers. The equipment needed to measure water levels should be installed by May or June 2003, when monitoring for 2003 is to begin.

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. Next baseline analysis will be in August 2005.

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

SBC-4, SBC-5; flow was not reported, although water-quality parameters were reported.

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

SBC-4: bicarbonate (n = 71), Ca (n = 33), Mg (n = 33), Na (n = 32), water temperature (n = 70), total alkalinity (n = 68), total hardness (n = 72), total anions (n = 70, not a required parameter), and total cations (n = 70, not a required parameter; cation-anion balance was 1.8 percent) were outside the two standard deviation range;

SBC-5: TDS (n = 63) was outside the two standard deviation range;

SBC-14: field conductivity (n = 20) was outside the two standard deviation range.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

	1 st month,	YES [X]	NO []
	2 nd month,	YES [X]	NO []
<i>Identify sites and months not monitored:</i>	3 rd month,	YES [X]	NO []

There was no flow at UPDES UTG040006 -002, -003, -006, and -007 during the fourth quarter. Data for these sites have not been submitted to the database, even though the Division received paper copies of the DMRs at the mid-term inspection.

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

UPDES UTG040006 -004 October, November, and December: “floating solids or visible foam” and “sanitary waste discharge assessment” were not reported to the Division.

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

UPDES UTG040006 -004 October: pH (Max, DMR; n = 97) was outside the two standard-deviation range.

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

Missing data for BC-1, BC-2, BC-3, SBC-3, and SBC-9A must be submitted.

“No access” was reported at piezometers SDH-2, SDH-3, MW-114, and MW-115 throughout the year. These are normally accessible from the surface. NOV #NO3-40-1-1 was issued on February 21, 2003 for failure to monitor these piezometers. The equipment needed to measure water levels should be installed by May or June 2003, when monitoring for 2003 begins.

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

Even though there was no flow, data for UPDES UTG040006 -002, -003, -006, and -007 for the fourth quarter need to be submitted to the database. The Division received paper copies of the DMRs at the mid-term inspection.