

OGMCOAL - Re: FW: Crandall Injection System

From: Steve Christensen
To: JD Leonard
Date: 3/20/2012 5:16 PM
Subject: Re: FW: Crandall Injection System
CC: Daron Haddock; Dave Shaver; David Hibbs; Karl Houskeeper; Ken Hoffma...

JD,

Thanks for the quick response. It sounds like you might have a bug in your computer system. I know how that goes. I just spent 30 minutes on the phone with our IT guy and my problem is still not fixed.

I'm confused JD. Just this morning you e-mailed me and said "*I wanted to inform you that until UEI is confident that our computer equations are correct (in connection with the Flocculent Injection System PPM)*". See e-mail below. You're now saying there's a problem with your computer system. Which is it?

The obvious concern is that if your automated injection system is having problems, it appears that you can't tell me what you're actual injection rate is. That's problematic because of the nature of the chemicals you're using, the stakeholders involved and the sensitivity of this site.

We need to know the actual rate of injection for both chemicals. You indicated that you're injecting at "*nearly the same rate*" and that the system is "*almost*" the same as when Dana was there. A reasonable read of that means something has obviously changed. What's changed and why is what I'm asking. If your program isn't showing you the correct injection rates, we've got a problem.

We need to talk about this. Would you and Dave call me or Ken Hoffman at your earliest convenience. We can do a conference call and see where we go from here.

Thanks,
Steve

Steve Christensen
 Environmental Scientist III
 Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
 (801) 538-5350

>>> "Leonard, JD" <jleonard@coalsource.com> 3/20/2012 4:03 PM >>>
Hi Steve,

Steve we believe that the (Flocculent PPM rates) and (Coagulant PPM rates) are being injected at **nearly the same** rate that we have been doing for the past several months at Crandall. We believe that the problem is in our computer system which is currently being worked on to try and figure the actual amount of Flocculent PPM that we inject, I will keep you updated on what we find. The reason we believe this, Steve; is because we have kept everything at the treatment facility **almost** the same since Dana left. Basically we believe that our Computer Program is not showing us the correct measurements of what were

injecting into the water.

2nd I contacted SGS Lab this morning and asked them to prepare for the Residual Polymer Test that they did for us last year, SGS informed me they will need 1 week to prepare for this test, I am not aware how long they will need after I get the sample to them, but as of right now we will be doing the Residual Polymer Test monthly and reporting to DOGM the results by the end of the next month.

Thank You
God Bless
JD Leonard

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Christensen [mailto:STEVECHRISTENSEN@utah.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2012 3:21 PM
To: Leonard, JD
Cc: Shaver, Dave; Ken Hoffman; OGMCOAL@utah.gov
Subject: Re: Crandall Injection System

Hi JD,

Thanks for getting back to me. Couple things: I'd like to know why the flocculant injection rate was doubled (from 2.5-3 ppm to 5.8 ppm) and the coagulant injection rate cut in half (30-40 ppm to 14 ppm). What was the reasoning behind that? Did something change at the site to prompt the change in injection rates (i.e. flows, iron levels)? The other thing I'd like to know is when you're going to test for the residual polymer? That should be done as soon as possible.

Please let me know when the residual polymer testing is going to happen, when you'd expect to get us the results and the reason the injection rates changed. I need to report to DWQ and the Forest Service so I'll need that information.

Thanks,
Steve

Steve Christensen
Environmental Scientist III
Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
(801) 538-5350

>>> "Leonard, JD" <jleonard@coalsource.com> 3/20/2012 11:18 AM >>>

Hi Steve,

I wanted to inform you that until UEI is confident that our computer equations are correct (in connection with the Flocculent Injection System PPM) , UEI will be monitoring Outfall 002 using a Residual Polymer Test monthly, with lab results reported to DOGM by the end of the following month. If you require any additional information regarding this matter please contact me.

Thank you
 God Bless
 JD Leonard

```
----- TEXT.htm follows -----
<HTML xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40" xmlns:v =3D
"urn:schemas-mi=
crosoft-com:vml" xmlns:o =3D "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" =
xmlns:w =3D "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" xmlns:m =3D
"http://sch=
emas.microsoft.com/office/2004/12/omml"><HEAD>
<META content=3D"text/html; charset=3Dutf-8" http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META name=3DGENERATOR content=3D"MSHTML 8.00.6001.19190">
<STYLE><!--
/* Font Definitions */
@font-face
{font-family:"Cambria Math";
panose-1:2 4 5 3 5 4 6 3 2 4;}
@font-face
{font-family:Calibri;
panose-1:2 15 5 2 2 2 4 3 2 4;}
/* Style Definitions */
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
{margin:0in;
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
font-size:11.0pt;
font-family:"Calibri","sans-serif";}
a:link, span.MsoHyperlink
{mso-style-priority:99;
color:blue;
text-decoration:underline;}
a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed
{mso-style-priority:99;
color:purple;
text-decoration:underline;}
span.EmailStyle17
{mso-style-type:personal-compose;
font-family:"Calibri","sans-serif";
color:windowtext;}
.MsoChpDefault
{mso-style-type:export-only;}
@page WordSection1
{size:8.5in 11.0in;
margin:1.0in 1.0in 1.0in 1.0in;}
div.WordSection1
{page:WordSection1;}
--></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY style=3D"MARGIN: 4px 4px 1px; FONT: 10pt Tahoma" lang=3DEN-US =
link=3Dblue vLink=3Dpurple>
<DIV>Hi JD,</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>Thanks for getting back to me.&nbsp;  Couple things: I'd like to
know =
why the flocculant injection rate was doubled (from 2.5-3 ppm to 5.8 =
```

