STATE OF NEVADA
Department of Conservation & Natural Resources
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
ndep NEVADA DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
protecting the future for generations
Jim Gibbons, Governor
Allen Biaggi, Director
Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Administrator

11 April 2007

NOTICE OF DECISION

Major Modification 2007

Water Pollution Control Permit
Number NEV0090056

Newmont USA Limited dba Newmont Mining Corporation

Mill 5/6-Gold Quarry-James Creek Project

The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection has decided to authorize a major modification to Water Pollution Control Permit NEV0090056 issued to Newmont Mining Corporation. This major modification authorizes the construction, operation, and closure of approved mining facilities in Eureka County. The Division has been provided with sufficient information, in accordance with Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 445A.350 through NAC 445A.447, to assure the Division that the groundwater quality will not be degraded by this operation, and that public safety and health will be protected.

The permit will become effective 26 April 2007. The final determination of the Administrator may be appealed to the State Environmental Commission pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 445A.605 and NAC 445A.407. All requests for appeals must be filed by 5:00 PM, 20 April 2007, on Form 3, with the State Environmental Commission, 901 South Stewart Street, Suite 4001, Carson City, Nevada 89701-5249. For more information, contact Miles Shaw at (775) 687-9409 or visit the Division's Bureau of Mining website at www.ndep.nv.gov/bmrr/bmrr01.htm.

A total of three (3) comment letters were received during the public comment period. They include letters in support of the proposed modification from Kevin Sur of Elko, and Robert K. Stokes, Elko County Manager, on behalf of the Elko County Board of Commissioners. A technical comment letter was received from Tom Myers, Phd., Hydrologic Consultant, on behalf of Great Basin Mine Watch. Excerpts from that letter with respective BMRR responses follow.

Response to Comments

The following are verbatim excerpts from the comment letter received by e-mail on 23 March 2007, from Tom Myers, PhD., Hydrologic Consultant, on behalf of Great Basin Mine Watch (GBMW). The comments are based on a 12 March 2007 visit to the BMRR office to review application and design documents and historic reporting data. (BMRR responses are provided in *italics*)

GBMW 1: "The major modification is an expansion of the tailings impoundment."

BMRR 1: The major modification is identified as the Mill 5/6 Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) West Expansion. It should be noted that the new facility is not hydraulically linked to the existing Mill 5/6 TSF, only physically abuts the west embankment of the Mill 5/6 TSF, so it can and will be operated independently of the existing Mill 5/6 TSF using an alternating tailings deposition cycle.

GBMW 2: "The design of this impoundment depends on the water balance completed by Ecological Resource Consultants (Mill 5/6 TSF Water Balance Model) and attached as an appendix to Newmont's Draft Fluid Management Plan submitted as part of the renewal of permit NEV0090056.

Ecological Resource Consultants (ERC 2007) calibrated their water balance model using the tailings saturation and evaporation from the tailings free water surface as calibration variables. Because of data limitations, they considered just an annual time step for 2005 for calibration. Based on no data, they assumed the tailings were 100% saturated. The calculations on Tables 2 and 3 (ERC 2007) show that they needed to increase evaporation from 30.2 inches per year, which had been obtained from micrometeorological theory, to 55.5 inches per year required to balance the steady state calculation (Ecological Resource Consultants 2007, pages 6 and 7).

There are several problems with this calibration. First, it assumes steady state conditions meaning there is no change in overall impoundment storage. However, over three billion gallons of slurry water were added. This slurry contained solids which would increase the total available water storage in the impoundment. If the tails are 100% saturated, because there were additional tailings solids added to the impoundment, there must have been water stored in the impoundment. ERC's calculations do not account for this."

BMRR 2: The calibration model included changes in storage over the 2005 calibration period. Data derived from actual operational experience was used in the model calibration and included, but was not necessarily limited to, Mill 5 production rate, Mill 6 production rate, Mill 5 slurry solids content, Mill 6 slurry solids content, reclaim water volume to Mill 5, reclaim water volume to Mill 6, tailings underdrain solution volume collected, precipitation based on 16 years of site-specific and 92 years of region-specific meteorological data, TSF supernatant pool depths, and consolidated tailings density (see Mill 5/6 TSF West Expansion Final Design Report Appendix 'F' and Appendix 'G'). Water storage at the beginning and end of the calibration period was estimated based on surveys of the tailings surface and a measured pond water depth. Free water in the impoundment was calculated to be approximately 97,500,000 gallons at both the beginning and the end of the calibration period (see design report Appendix 'G', Section 4). The free water in the impoundment is not the total "three billion gallons" reporting to the TSF in the slurry. The sub-aerial deposition method dewaters and consolidates the slurry solid fraction and the majority (65% to 80%) of the slurry liquid fraction is returned to the process facilities via the reclaim and underdrain systems.

GBMW 3: "Second, the comparison ERC makes with pan evaporation at Beowawe ignores the pan coefficient. To determine the actual evaporation, it is necessary to multiply the pan evaporation by the coefficient, usually about 0.7, to determine actual evaporation. Doing so here, 0.7 x 55.5 equals 38.8 inches. This suggests that ERC did not properly calibrate the model."

<u>BMRR 3:</u> A comparison between pan evaporation at regional sites was made with the calibrated evaporation rate to check the reasonableness of the data. The model was calibrated by adjusting annual evaporation losses, which is not dependent on any evaporation coefficient.

For a tailings facility with the sub-aerial deposition methods used at the site, typical evaporation rates are closer to 90% of pan values. This is a result of the shallow water depth.

From a sensitivity standpoint, the exact amount of evaporation, while important, is not expected to significantly alter results. If modeled evaporation from the free water surface is 12 inches less than actual evaporation, then over the course of a year the average water level in the tailings pond would increase by one foot assuming more water were not used as reclaim.

<u>GBMW 4:</u> "For the predictive model, ERC converted annual evaporation to daily based on a monthly distribution of evaporation determined from the micrometeorological calculations. They assumed that tailings areas not covered with water, ie not saturated at the surface, would evaporate at 75% of the free surface rate. Without justification, for example knowledge of the depth to saturation which would affect the rate of exfiltration, they assumed that evaporation would continue at rates three-quarters of the free surface rate. Assuming this rate allows the entire tailings profile to go dry. This may explain why, during the predictive phase, the tailings water volume goes to zero which seems to be impossible. From the discussion, the water volume is not just the ponded volume; if I am incorrect in that assessment, please explain."

<u>BMRR 4:</u> An average evaporation coefficient of 75% of the free water surface was used in the model to estimate evaporative losses from the tailings surface based on results from the calibration model and engineering judgment. The Water Balance model was calibrated based on the operational year 2005 when Newmont performed bathometric and physical surveys at various times during the year. A "proof of Principal" Calibration set to an existing operation is believed superior to the suggested numeric model when sufficient operational information exists, particularly when depth of saturation in the tailings and actual resulting evaporation rates will change in response to meteorological inputs and outputs, pond management, and tailings deposition.

The model does indeed allow the free water supernatant pool to go dry, but not the tailings profile. There are times when the facility is idle and the net water losses from the system exceed total water inputs. During these times, free water volume in the supernatant pool will diminish. The model limits evaporative losses to the volume of the free water supernatant pool and assumes no continued evaporation from the tailings surface once the volume of water in the free water supernatant pool is lost from the system. In actuality, depending on how the supernatant pool and tailings deposition are managed, portions of the water from the tailings surface could drain into the supernatant pool, increasing free water in the supernatant pool and related evaporation but decreasing the saturation level within the tailings mass. This condition would result in greater water losses than those predicted by the model.

The method used in the model is conservative in that it limits total evaporation loss from the TSF to the volume of the free water supernatant pool. Doing so could, therefore, underestimate loss and overestimate water in the TSF.

GBMW 5: "The volume/area relationships used by ERC appear to have problems as well. The data presented in ERC Appendix B includes tailings elevation, water surface area, unsaturated tails area, and accumulated water volume. For the existing tailings (ERC, page 46), it appears that the water surface area is not a function of the tailings elevation; for example, there is more water surface area for tails elevation equal to 5466 than for tails elevation equal to 5506, but at tails elevation just 2 feet higher, at 5508, the water surface area is higher. The graphs of this data show all kinds of variation with relations crossing each other. Please explain how this is possible. Since this data is for existing tailings, presumably the low tails elevation has already been surpassed by the disposal of tailings. Please explain why this information is even relevant to the presented modeling."

BMRR 5: Future filling of the existing Mill 5/6 facility was modeled by interpreting information from actual survey information of the existing tailings storage facility. Surveys of the tailings surface were completed in May 2005 and October 2005, resulting in a somewhat different tailings surface shape, most likely due to deposition locations and various pond sizes during the year. Since the modeled pond slope (0.72%) is greater than the beach slope (0.45%), a fluctuation in the pond capacity versus area was observed. Future tailings surfaces were modeled after these surfaces in order to capture the changing pond configuration throughout the year. Consequently, varying pond capacities versus water surface area resulted. What is not clear in the referenced data presentation is that these are only "look-up" tables utilized by the model to calculate water surface or tailings surface areas relative to a given water volume. These areas were used in the water balance analysis to estimate evaporation from both the water surface and the tailings beach and do not represent specific operational data.

GBMW 6: "The data for the expansion tailings impoundment is more understandable; for a given tails elevation, as the water volume increases, as the water volume increases, both the pond elevation and the water surface area also increase. After the ponded water completely covers the tails, the area increases according to the slope of the embankment.

ERC does not present the hydraulic properties of the tailings impoundment. How does this model predict the underdrain rate? How does the model predict flow through the tails?"

BMRR 6: Underdrain rates in the proposed Mill 5/6 TSF West Expansion were calculated based on Darcy's equation Q=kiA. Figure 4.1 (Mill 5/6 TSF West Expansion Final Design Report) shows the "Tailings Permeability Versus Depth Estimate". The tailings coefficients of permeability (k) range from 7.0×10^{-6} cm/sec to 4.3×10^{-6} cm/sec. These permeability values are consistent with clayey silts and silts that compose the tailings solids. Several cone penetration tests were completed on the existing Mill 5/6 TSF and coefficients of permeability correlated from the field data correspond to values used in the underdrain flow rate calculation. The tailings beach and supernatant pool areas (A) were generated from snapshots of the facility modeled at different supernatant pool/tailings mass elevations. The hydraulic gradient (i) was calculated based on tailings mass thickness and supernatant pool depths associated with the proposed facility at different times as it is filled. Underdrain rates in the existing Mill 5/6 TSF were determined based on underdrain volumes observed during 2005 and observed long-term trends *(see Appendix 'G', Section 5.5.1). This historic operational data was the basis for values used in the models.*

GBMW 7: "The predictive phase of the modeling uses 100 traces of stochastically generated precipitation to analyze the tailings water balance. Because of the problems with the parameterization discussed above, NDEP should have very low confidence in the results as presented even with the uncertainty analysis inherent in the results. Perhaps the excessively high evaporation rates discussed above explain why there is too little reclaim water at times (ER, page 25).

During the predictive modeling phase, ERC also assumed away problems. For example they indicate that occasionally the "calculated underdrain from the expansion TSA plus 50% of the anticipated losses fro [*from*] the existing TSF exceed the maximum rate of 1,300 gpm that will be pumped from the underdrain collection pond" (ERC 2007, page 12). They just assumed in the calculations that the total losses from the expansion TSF would be reduced so that the total equaled 1300 gpm. How is that possible? Does this not indicate that their own modeling suggest the drainage system capacity will be exceeded?"

BMRR 7: The limit of 1,300 gpm is based on the existing reclaim solution pumping capacity in Underdrain Pond 1. Valves installed on the underdrain outlet pipeline at the Underdrain Valve Access Pad, located between the Mill 5/6 TSF West Expansion embankment and the Underdrain Pond 1, can be used to limit underdrain flow reporting to the Underdrain Pond 1 by throttling the valves if required. The need to throttle flow might occur during the initial months of tailings deposition, prior to the time a layer of tailings material will have accumulated over the tailings basin that will restrict flow through the drainage blanket and into the underdrain solution collection pipeline system. This is a normal condition on start-up of new tailings facilities. It should also be noted that modeled maximum underdrain flow for the Mill 5/6 TSF West Expansion, with 100% beach saturation, is predicted to range from approximately 550 to 850 gallons per minute. The underdrain flow rate over the life of the facility is anticipated to range more typically between 500 and 700 gallons per minute.

GBMW 8: "There should also be predictions made into the future, after closure. Precipitation of course will continue to cause long-term seepage. There should be a prediction of the future seepage from this very large tailings impoundment."

BMRR 8: Section 10.2 of the Mill 5/6 TSF West Expansion Final Design Report includes a discussion of the closure of the facility and the water balance calculations in Appendix 'G' incorporate proposed closure scenarios. Modeling indicates the bulk of draindown will occur over 15 years following completion of reclamation and closure activities on the combined Mill 5/6 TSF and Mill 5/6 TSF West Expansion. Long-term estimates of draindown for the combined facilities are expected to be in the range of 3 to 5 gallons per minute after 12 years. This rate resembles the actual conditions observed at the James Creek TSF, which has been inactive since the mid-1990's but has not been covered or capped. The current James Creek TSF draindown rate is in the range of 3 gallons per minute.

GBMW 9: "Monitoring data shows that the waste rock is a potential source of acid mine drainage and arsenic pollution.

The ANP/AGP ratio is low enough to indicate potential problems, especially since it is unknown just how representative one sample may be (Table 1). The values for other quarters also indicate potential problems. In reality, whether drainage through these dumps will be acidic depends on the rate that acid is produced and that the carbonate rock can neutralize it. This can only be determined with kinetic testing; the NDEP should add the requirement for kinetic testing to the permit for all samples that have ANP/AGP less than 5.0. This recommended limit is somewhat arbitrary, but is based on my experience studying static testing observed at other mines which have ultimately had AMD problems.

Contaminants exceeding standards in the MWMP tests show that drainage from these dumps may degrade groundwater, if it reaches groundwater (Figure 1 showing the concentrations of some contaminants measured at the Gold Quarry North and South Dumps). The first quarter MWMP test from the North Dump is a good example (Figure 1). As, Cd, Mn, SO4, TDS and Zn all exceeded the primary standard by at least twofold. This observation also had no alkalinity and pH equal to 3.89. This is not the sample represented in the ABA tests in Table 1, but rather is an example of how samples taken from different dumps or locations in dumps could vary substantially. The MWMP sample for the South Dump is that reported in the table, and it does have high alkalinity and neutral pH, but high Zn, TDS, SO4, Ni, Mn, Cd and As. The Leeville dump exhibits alkaline mine drainage, with pH exceeding 9.0. It releases high concentrations of contaminants including nitrate. Kinetic testing could improve the estimates of contaminants expected to drain from the dumps."

BMRR 9: *The regulatory limit is on degradation of water. Extensive facility monitoring is used to ensure there is no degradation. All example results presented are for meteoric water mobility procedure (MWMP) extractions and exhibit significant net neutralizing potential (NNP) and ANP:AGP ratios in excess of the BMRR minimum 1.2:1 ratio requirement for kinetic testing. The permitted facility has an approved waste rock management plan, which includes a plan with guidelines for the engineered construction of potentially acid generating waste rock and refractory ore stockpile facilities. At a minimum, a waste rock or stockpile design must include a low-permeability, compacted base of neutralizing material and a solution collection system.*

GBMW 10: "*Pete Waste Rock Dump spring*: The spring buried by the Pete Waste Rock dump (MP WRDFS) also shows substantial exceedences. Of the four quarters reported in the 3rd quarter monitoring report, only the 1st and 2nd of 2006 had any flow. Concentrations substantially exceeded standards for As, Mn, NO_3 and Se. Unlike any of the MWMP tests, the May sample also exceeded standards, by ten times, for Al and Fe.

This spring was a permanent water source prior to being buried by the waste rock. It will continue to be a permanent source of pollution from under the waste rock. The spring also is indicative of problems which may occur due to intermittent seepage through the other waste rock dumps. NDEP should require Newmont to complete a plan as a schedule of compliance item in the permit for treating this discharge or for otherwise stopping the contamination."

BMRR 10: *First, it must be clarified that the monitoring location identified as PT-WRDFS (the GBMW notation is incorrect) is for a seep discovered during the cut-and-fill operations associated with construction of the low permeability base of Pete Waste Rock Disposal Facility (Pete WRDF). Contrary to the GBMW assertion, this was not a permanent water source prior to construction of the facility and no evidence of a seep or spring existed prior to excavation and preparation of the low permeability base for the facility.*

Following discovery, the seep location was over-excavated and a perforated collection pipeline was placed in a trench cut from the seep to the downgradient toe of the Pete WRDF. The soil base of the trench was scarified, moisture-conditioned, and compacted. The trench was backfilled and the pipeline covered with characterized neutralizing waste rock to create a French drain collection system. The French drain was covered with a layer of geotextile and the low permeability soli layer base of the Pete WRDF. PT-WRDFS is monitored for flow on a weekly basis and any solution discharge is sampled and analyzed for Profile I-A constituents, which are reported quarterly. Any discharge from the French drain discharge pipe reports to a lined solution collection channel and is collected in the double synthetic-lined and leak detected Pete WRDF Collection Pond. Collected solution must be used within process solution containment or shown to meet all Profile I-A standards prior to use outside containment.

In should be noted that the collection system has only been in operation since the first quarter of 2006, and during that 4-quarter period, flow has only been reported from the collection system during the 2 initial (spring and summer) quarters. However, the BMRR had already noted the poor water quality and is requesting a review of the construction as-builts and the analytical data for the French drain waste rock backfill material to determine a potential source of the poor water quality. The BMRR will take appropriate action based on the results of the completed review.

<u>GBMW 11:</u> "*North WRDF Effluent*: This monitoring point apparently is discharge from the north waste rock dump which had seeped into the reclaimed pregnant solution pond (Fact Sheet, page 12). The description is confusing but the discharge apparently is waste rock seepage that is collected onto the old liner; it now is discharged to the new solution pond. When it flows, the water quality is very poor. It has low pH, 3.87 and 3.25, during the 1^{st} and 2^{nd} quarter 2006. The other two quarters were dry. During the wet quarters, the contaminant concentrations are screamingly high. The following is a list of exceedences with some actual observations in parantheses: Al (130 and 75.1 mg/l), As (13.1 mg/l), Cd (3.95 and 3.54 mg/l), Cu, F (10.8 and 27.1), Fe (268 mg/l),Mn (11.9 and 23.9 mg/l), Se (0.2 and 0.21 mg/l), Sr (2.87 mg/l), V (3.27 mg/l), Zn (124 and 162 mg/l).

If this is actually waste rock seepage, it represents potentially a major long-term water quality problem NDEP should require Newmont to complete a schedule of compliance item to show how they will assure that seepage from this location will not degrade groundwater quality into the future.

If my assessment of this seepage is wrong, please provide an improved explanation in the response to comments."

<u>BMRR 11:</u> The North Waste Rock Disposal Facility has been constructed in phases in accordance with either Newmont's <u>Refractory Ore Stockpile and Waste Dump Design, Construction & Monitoring Guidelines, 1995</u>, or Newmont's <u>Refractory Ore Stockpile and Waste Rock Dump Design, Construction and Monitoring Plan, January 2003</u>, depending upon construction vintage. At a minimum, both versions require that each lift of refractory or potentially acid generating (PAG) waste be placed on a compacted, low permeability base and encapsulated within neutralizing waste material. The design also incorporates surface water controls to minimize infiltration. The final lift must be covered with a low permeability cap and final reclamation includes additional cover and vegetation to further minimize infiltration of meteoric water.

Solution emanating from the facility has always been collected and conveyed to a process pond. Prior to mid-2005, flow from North Waste Rock Disposal Facility was commingled with flows from other sources, such as the inactive James Creek Tailings Facility and the Gold Quarry Heap Leach Pad, and sampled as part of the solution pond inventory. Since the expansion of the facility in 2005, solution emanating from the toe of the facility is collected separately in a synthetic-lined collection channel for conveyance via double-walled HDPE pipeline to the Gold Quarry Solution Pond. Monitoring location NWRDF-E designates waste rock solution collected at its point of discharge to the double synthetic-lined and leak detected Gold Quarry Solution Pond. In the six (6) quarters the designated system has been in operation, flow has been reported for two (2) quarters. When flow does occur, collected solution is analyzed for Profile II constituents and the results are reported quarterly.

Regrading of the facility and placement of final cover are in progress. The Closure Plan is designed to eliminate flow from the toe of the facility. However, solution collection and downgradient monitoring will continue as necessary until the BMRR determines closure is complete.

GBMW 12: "*Sub-base*: The engineering design of the waste rock dumps has a sub-base compacted to the equivalent of one foot of 1×10^{-5} cm/sec material. This is the equivalent of 0.028 ft/d. As water ponds on the sub-base and the bottom of the base is not saturated, the gradient will equal 1 and about 35 days will be all it takes for seepage to go all the way through the sub-base. As the ponding increases and the sub-base becomes saturated, the seepage rate will become higher. NDEP should consider for the future specifying lower subbase conductivity values."

BMRR 12: In accordance with the plans cited in BMRR 11, any refractory or PAG waste facility is designed with a layer of coarse buffer material placed on the compacted, low permeability base that is constructed with a gradient to promote free-draining of solution to a collection point. The BMRR does not believe the approved design will allow solution to pond or saturate the base.

GBMW 13: "*Waste Rock Slump*: None of the documents that I reviewed discussed the waste rock slump which occurred two years ago. Much of that waste rock remains where it landed. This rock is no longer on the sub-base discussed in the previous subsection. If this assumption is not correct, please explain what has happened to remediate that slump. But if it does remain, NDEP should require Newmont to analyze whether seepage from the slumped waste rock is more likely to degrade waters of the state. This should be a schedule of compliance item in the renewal permit."

BMRR 13: GBMW is correct that the fact sheet does not contain a reference to the Gold Quarry Slide that occurred 05 February 2005. A reference has been added.

With regard to the cause of the slide and the status of displaced material, a final report titled Gold Quarry Slide, Geotechnical Investigation, Failure Mechanisms Report, January 2006, prepared by Call & Nicholas, Inc., addresses the issues in detail. Oxide material from the leading edge of the slide was characterized and moved to a final location on the east side of State Route 766. Final contouring and seeding operations were completed in late September 2005. Based on the report, slumped refractory and PAG waste material were relocated onto *containment with a compacted subbase and, along with the face of the slump, recontoured to achieve overall slope angles of approximately 5.1H:1V. Stability monitoring of the recontoured facility has been initiated and downgradient groundwater monitoring continues.*

GBMW 14: "**James Creek Pumpback Wells:** The Fact Sheet, page 24, notes that the James Creek tailings pond was leaking process solution into groundwater. It was noticed in 1990 and was evidenced by the presence of WAD cyanide and elevated TDS in monitoring wells. The fact sheet also notes that quarterly sampling of four wells and two pumpback wells continues. The draft permit only notes two pumpback wells PB-1 and PB-2 which suggests th *[text as received]*

It is not clear from the monitoring reports why NDEP believe this remediation is complete. During the first quarter 2006, sampling at JCPB5 showed that numerous constituents violated standards. These include Cd (0.0195 mg/l), Mn (1.47 mg/l), Ni (0.151 mg/l), EC (3210 umhos), Se (0.178 mg/l), SO_4 (1830 mg/l), and TDS (3230 mg/l). That the well was dry or not pumped during other quarters is irrelevant. Both JC-PB1 and 2 continue to only show slightly elevated values of EC. Please explain these results. Also, please explain why NDEP would allow the cessation of pumpback wells at the only well which shows contamination."

BMRR 14: Nowhere does the BMRR (NDEP) state that "this remediation is complete". In addition to the two (2) pumpback wells, four (4) monitoring wells - GQ-7B, GQ-10B, GQE-265, and PB-5 - remain in place and operational. These wells are sampled and reported quarterly for Profile I-A constituents and water level.

The BMRR is closely monitoring PB-5, which reports periodic exceedances, but is commonly dry. The other near-by monitor wells do not report exceedances, suggesting contamination in PB-5 is localized. If constituent levels in PB-5 increase significantly, the BMRR may require further evaluation and possible remediation, as warranted. The Permit continues to contain the previous requirement that pump-back wells be equipped and maintained to allow pump-back operations to resume on short notice and that additional wells may be required if conditions warrant.

GBMW 15: "**Pit Lake:** Great Basin Mine Watch supports the requirement, specified as a schedule of compliance item, that any operational or facility change that could change the predictions of the future pit lake be incorporated into an update of the pit lake model. However, because it has been six years since the pit lake model was originally developed, NDEP should require Newmont to verify the assumptions in that model. This would include verifying that the geologic formations bounding the pit, as currently observed in the as-built condition, are close to those assumed in the model. This is because the inflow chemistry depends substantially on the geologic formations from which the groundwater inflow to the pit emanates; if the mix of groundwater changes, the predicted pit lake quality will also change."

BMRR 15: The BMRR specifically asked Newmont, as part of the major modification application review, if the pit lake study required an update. Newmont advised the BMRR that the current and planned operational activities and physical conditions still fall within the range of criteria modeled for the South Operation Area Project: Gold Quarry Pit Lake Prediction, December 1997, and the Gold Quarry Pit Lake Chemistry Update, July 2001.