



# STATE OF NEVADA

Department of Conservation & Natural Resources

DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Brian Sandoval, Governor

Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Director

Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator

## NOTICE OF DECISION - Bureau of Mining Regulation and Reclamation

Web Posting: 07/16/2012

Deadline for Comment: 08/16/2012

Golden Eagle Mine  
WPC Permit No. NEV0060034

### Miramar Gold Corporation

The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (Division) has decided to renew Water Pollution Control Permit (WPCP) NEV0060034 to Miramar Gold Corporation. This permit authorizes the construction, operation, and closure of approved mining facilities in Storey 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 waters of the State will not be degraded by this operation, and that public safety and health will be protected.

The permit will become effective July 31, 2012. 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, July 26, 2012, on Form 3, with the State Environmental Commission, 901 South Stewart Street, Suite 4001, Carson City, Nevada 89701-5249. For more information, contact Karl McCrea at (775) 687-9407 or visit the Division's Bureau of Mining Regulation website at [www.ndep.nv.gov/bmrr/bmrr01.htm](http://www.ndep.nv.gov/bmrr/bmrr01.htm)

Two comment e-mails were received during the public comment period.

### RESPONSE TO COMMENTS:

**The following comments were received via Email from Newmont Mining Corporation on 21 June 2012 and 25 June 2012**

(NDEP Responses in bold *italics*)

Comments 1 and 11 are directed at Section I.H and Section I.D (1), respectively, of the Draft Water Pollution Control Permit while all other comments refer to the Draft Fact Sheet.

Comment 1: ‘... Section I.H., which requires us to inspect the site twice per month... In view of the fact that the site has been physically stable for several years...’

***NDEP Response: The intent of this WPCP monitoring requirement needs clarification. It was not the intent of this monitoring requirement to necessitate an inspection of the entire site ‘twice per month’. It is true that the overall site has been physically stable for many years and that twice monthly inspection of the entire site are indeed not necessary. The ‘twice per month’ monitoring requirement is focused on the Bonanza Evaporation Ponds Improvement Project. It is a Bureau of Mining Regulation and Reclamation (BMRR) Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) to require enhanced monitoring of any newly created or updated/improved fluid management system, for a least a short time, and that is the rationale for this enhanced monitoring requirement. However, monthly monitoring will suffice provided that the Permittee is able to demonstrate compliance with Part I.D. footnote 1.***

***Part I.H. of the WPCP has been revised to: The Permittee shall inspect all control devices, systems and facilities on a minimum quarterly basis and on a minimum monthly basis following completion of the Bonanza Evaporation Ponds Improvement Project.***

Fact Sheet:

Comment 2: Page 1 Location should be sections 23, 24, and 26.

***NDEP Response: The location has been corrected.***

Comment 3: Page 1 Synopsis and Page 4 Heap state that the heap contains about 450,000 tons of ore. American Eagle Resources, Inc. documents show that the heap contains about 835,000 tons of ore.

***NDEP Response: The heap tonnage has been corrected to 835,000 tons.***

Comment 4: Page 1 Synopsis; the Newmont acquisition of Miramar was initiated in 2007, but not finalized until 2008.

***NDEP Response: The synopsis has been corrected to March 2008 based on the 17 March 2008 Newmont Mining Corporation press release.***

Comment 5: Page 2 Pits; according to the “Addendum to Workplan for Backfilling Bonanza Pit” 2000, the total backfill thickness should be approximately 50 feet, and about 40 feet above the expected water level.

***NDEP Response: Review of drawings provided in the “Addendum to Workplan for Backfilling Bonanza Pit” (The Mines Group, April 2000) indicates a total backfill depth to pit bottom of approximately 50 feet. The Fact Sheet has been corrected to reflect the proper depth of backfill.***

Comment 6: Page 3 Pits; states that any ponded water in the Bonanza Pit would be sampled for Profile I, while the Permit says Profile III.

**NDEP Response:** *The Fact Sheet has been corrected to reflect the Profile III analysis.*

Comment 7: Page 5 Process Ponds; the existing tank in Pond 4 is approximately 2,500 gallons.

**NDEP Response:** *The Fact Sheet has been corrected to reflect a tank volume of 2,500 gallons.*

Comment 8: Page 6 Process Ponds; mentions a 2" leak detection pipe in Pond 2. I am not aware of this. Does it still exist?

**NDEP Response:** *Review of the "Golden Eagle Mine Final Closure, Reclamation and As-Built Report", dated May 14, 2002, Section 3.4.2, states that "the leak detection piping has not been altered in any way", indicating that the pipe still exists.*

Comment 9: Page 15 Rational; off the top of my head I'm not sure if the Post Closure WPCP was signed in December 2003 or January 2004, but the 2006 date shown here does not seem correct. Page 2 states 2004, but I thought it was 2003.

**NDEP Response:** *The date has been verified and corrected to December 2003.*

Comment 10: And a final question - when we submit the revised pond improvement design, will it require another EDC fee?

**NDEP Response:** *Yes, the conversion of Pond 4 to a double-lined process component will be an engineering design change (EDC).*

Comment 11: In addition to the site inspection frequency, which we discussed, I also meant to ask about the leak detection frequency.

It used to be quarterly. The draft WPCP Monitoring Requirements Table says monthly, although Note (1) after the Table says bi-weekly. Could this increased frequency also be for a short period after construction, like the site inspections, and then go back to quarterly?

**(1) NDEP Response:** *Yes. Part I.D. Footnote (1) has been revised to the following: "The sump must be inspected and evacuated on a more frequent basis than quarterly if the fluid level is above the top of the sump or the invert of any pipe which discharges into the sump, whichever level is lower. Following completion of the Bonanza Evaporation Ponds Improvement Project, the sump must be inspected and evacuated on a monthly basis or on a more frequent basis if the fluid level is above the top of the sump or the invert of any pipe which discharges into the sump, whichever level is lower..."*

