FACT SHEET
(Pursuant to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 445A.401)

Permittee Name: Robinson Nevada Mining Company

Project Name: Robinson Operation

Permit Number: NEV0092105

Review Type/Year/Revision: Renewal 2017, Fact Sheet Revision 00

A. Location and General Description

Location: The Robinson Operation facility is located in White Pine County, within Sections 1, 12-14, 23-26, 35, and 36, Township 16 North (T16N), Range 61 East (R61E); Sections 2-24, and 29-31, T16N, R62E; Sections 7, 8, and 17-20, T16N, R63E; and Sections 19-21, 28-30, 32, and 33, T17N, R62E, Mount Diablo Baseline and Meridian, approximately 9 miles west of the town of Ely, Nevada. The facility is located both on private land controlled by the Permittee (over 7,000 acres) and on public land administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Bristlecone Field Office, located in Ely, Nevada (over 1,000 acres).

General Description: Copper ore is mined from historic open pits, processed through the Robinson flotation mill and concentrator circuit to produce copper and molybdenum concentrates, for shipment to off-site (out of state) smelters for refining. Gold is primarily recovered as a by-product in a gravity separation process and minor amounts are recovered in the copper concentrate. Water pumped from the open pits, freshwater wells and other sources, including Mine-Impacted Waters (MIWs), is used for process make-up water. The freshwater wells also provide potable water and fire suppression water. Waste rock is placed primarily on and over historic waste rock dumps (WRDs) and managed to minimize the potential for acid generation. Tailings from the Robinson Mill are conveyed by slurry pipelines for subaerial deposition in the Giroux Wash Tailings Impoundment. Conceptual designs were submitted for construction of a copper heap leach facility with a solvent extraction/electrowinning circuit and designs were approved for expansion of the existing Weary Flats D-Pad gold heap leach facility. Construction of the copper heap leach facility cannot be initiated until detailed design drawings are submitted to and approved by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (the Division). Approval to construct remaining phases of the Weary Flats D-Pad gold heap leach facility was rescinded in June 2011.

Facilities are required to be designed, constructed, operated, and closed without any discharge or release in excess of those standards established in regulation, except for meteorological events that exceed the design storm event.
B. Synopsis

Water Pollution Control Permit and Operations Chronology: On 28 January 1988, Water Pollution Control Permit NEV0060003 was issued to Silver King Mines for the E (East) Robinson Project, which included the construction, operation, and closure of the A-, B-, and C-Pad gold heap leach facilities that were built on historic acid-leached dumps (ALDs) and WRDs surrounding the Ruth Pit.

In early 1991 (the exact issue date does not appear in the Bureau of Mining Regulation and Reclamation database), Water Pollution Control Permit NEV0090030 was issued to Magma Nevada Mining Company (Magma) for the Weary Flats Project, which included construction, operation, and closure of the Weary Flats D-Pad gold heap leach facility. Magma also acquired the Silver King Mines and other mining interests in the district about this time.

On 28 February 1992, Magma submitted an application to dewater the Liberty Pit Lake into the Ruth Pit. On 22 August 1992, Water Pollution Control Permit NEV0092102, for the Liberty Pit, was issued to Magma for this activity.

On 15 July 1993, Water Pollution Control Permit NEV0092105, for the West Robinson Project (renamed the Robinson Operation in late 2007), was issued to Magma for construction, operation, and closure of mining, milling, concentrator circuit, tailings facilities, and new copper heap leach facilities.

In January 1996, Broken Hill Proprietary (BHP) acquired Magma Copper Company, the parent of Magma, its subsidiaries and assets. The Magma assets were placed in the BHP subsidiary BHP Copper Nevada, Inc., which later became BHP Nevada Mining Company (BHP-Nevada).

In January 1996, BHP-Nevada completed construction of the copper process components and Giroux Wash Tailings Impoundment as permitted under NEV0092105, and initiated operations. The copper flotation mill and all related facilities were operated through June 1999, at which time the Robinson Operation was placed into a Temporary Closure as defined under NAC 445A.382; as a result of the Temporary Closure action, Site Characterization Plans (SCPs) and Interim Stabilization Measures were initiated by BHP-Nevada.

At renewal of NEV0092105 on 24 August 1999, the conditions and limitations set forth in Permits NEV0060003, NEV0090030 and NEV0092102 were consolidated and incorporated into NEV0092105. Concurrent with the 1999 renewal of NEV0092105, Permits NEV0060003 (East Robinson Project), NEV0090030 (Weary Flats Project), and NEV0092102 (Liberty Pit) were cancelled by request of the Permittee.
A Final Plan for Permanent Closure (FPPC) was submitted as required by the Division on 23 August 2002, in order to initiate final permanent closure of the facility by 24 August 2004, as required by NAC 445A.446, if the facility were to remain in Temporary Closure. A review of the submitted FPPC was initiated but final approval was not given due to failure by BHP to provide revisions required by the Division and the resumption of facility operation prior to the final permanent closure deadline.

On 08 April 2004, Quadra Mining Ltd. (Quadra) purchased BHP-Nevada from parent BHP, now the merged BHP-Billiton. NEV0092105 was transferred to Robinson Nevada Mining Company (RNMC), a subsidiary of Quadra, on 26 April 2004. Quadra merged with FNX in 2010 to become Quadra FNX, which was subsequently purchased by KGHM Polska Miedz S.A. (KGHM) in 2012; however, RNMC remained as the Permittee throughout these transactions. RNMC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of KGHM and is the current Permittee for the Robinson Operation.

Temporary Closure ended and RNMC resumed mining in June 2004, followed by resumption of beneficiation and related activities on 01 September 2004. Mining continues from the historic open pits. Copper and molybdenum are recovered in the Robinson Mill flotation circuit and gold is recovered with an added gravity concentration circuit. Mining is conducted on a daily basis and incorporates mixing and placement of waste rock consistent with the Comprehensive Waste Rock Management Plan (WRMP) that is currently under Division Review. Overdumping of closed facility components is designed to promote stormwater runoff, minimize infiltration, advance closure of the facility, and ultimately eliminate historic MIWs and MIW sources (see below).

Consent Agreement and Order dated 25 February 1997: A Consent Agreement and Order was executed 25 February 1997, on behalf of BHP-Nevada and the Division and is commonly referred to as the “1997 Consent Agreement”. The 1997 Consent Agreement was developed to resolve a Finding of Alleged Violation and Order issued 20 August 1996, for alleged violations of discharge limits set by the Permit for the Giroux Wash Tailings Storage Facility (TSF), and a second Finding of Alleged Violation and Order issued 02 May 1996, for the accidental release of tailings from the TSF on or about 12 February 1996.

In addition to imposing cash penalties, the final 1997 Consent Agreement addressed design, construction and operational aspects of the TSF, the use of MIW as an alternative to fresh water in the mill and the identification and final management (i.e., final closure) of MIW sources, and the stabilization and final closure of the ‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’, and ‘D’ heap leach pads. Key requirements and outcomes identified in the 1997 Consent Agreement and further detailed in the associated “Work Plan: Robinson Operation” (Work Plan), attached to the 1997 Consent Agreement as Exhibit ‘F’, include but are not limited to:
• Construction of the bentonite-amended Barge Operating Channel (BOC) to reduce the supernatant pond size, provide interim protection of groundwater, and facilitate beneficial reuse of supernatant pond water;

• Design and construction of modifications to TSF downstream sediment controls and cyclone deposition systems and associated operational modifications to enhance beach development and reduce the potential for infiltration;

• Total dissolved solids (TDS) mobility testing to determine operational chemical characteristics of tailings material, demonstrate the effectiveness of TSF management to protect waters of the State, and determine the solute transport, adsorption, and natural attenuation mechanisms occurring within and beneath the TSF;

• Evapoconcentration analysis to determine the effects of recirculation and evaporation on the chemistry of process water for use in the facility water balance, predictive modeling, and determination of mixing ratios for use of MIW, fresh water, and reclaim water in the mill process and to control supernatant water quality;

• Column testing of the organic-containing A-horizon soil column to determine if surficial soils removed in preparation for TSF expansion could provide lower permeability and greater attenuation of the tailing solution constituents than underlying B-horizon soils;

• Install a new monitor well and monitoring network to characterize groundwater and develop hydrologic block models for the project site to identify and refine the understanding of groundwater flow and controls, determine the hydrologic relationships between dumps and the historic impacts to hydrologic systems, evaluate the capacity for natural attenuation, identify sources of ground and surface waters for use in the Mill, and use collected information to develop flow and transport models;

• Evaluate MIW, a product of historic mining that includes specific pit lakes and seeps from ALDs, for use or re-use as mill make-up water in accordance with the “Four-Step Protocol,” developed through analysis of the Intera Pond;

• Based on completed evaluation and analysis, BHP-Nevada and the Division, must negotiate a “Final Water Source Area Management Plan” (Plan) to culminate in a final approval by the Division to use and manage MIW in accordance with the Plan and consistent with Division regulations;

• Any disturbance or alteration of any MIW, other than the activities described in the Work Plan, must be in accordance with separately prepared plans submitted to and approved by the Division; and

Milling and Processing Facilities: The existing Robinson Mill and Concentrator were constructed by predecessor Magma in 1995-96, to the north of the Liberty Pit in the area known historically as Riepetown. The Mill is designed to process crushed copper and molybdenum ore, conveyed from an adjacent 211,000 ton ore stockpile pad, at a maximum 62,000 tons per day and a nominal 45,000 tons per day. With the 2016 renewal, the maximum annual processing rate authorized in the Permit was increased from 17,500,000 tons of ore per year to 19,500,000 tons of ore per year, which is equivalent to an average of 53,425 tons of ore per day over the year.

The Mill grinding and gravity flotation concentrator circuit consists of a number of components including, but not limited to, a 32-foot diameter semi-autogenous grinding (SAG) mill, two ball mills, two parallel trains of six rougher flotation cells, two regrind mills, two cleaner column cells, a train of three cleaner scavenger cells, and associated tanks, basins, and sumps located in a metal-clad Mill building. Secondary containment for the components and conveyance systems is provided by sloped concrete floors that drain to area sumps equipped with pumps for return of solution to process. The entire Mill floor is contained by a 2.5 foot-high concrete stemwall constructed around the building perimeter, with raised concrete berms at points of ingress and egress.

The molybdenum flotation plant, which was approved as a minor modification by the Division in August 2005 and constructed later in 2005, is an add-on expansion to the existing copper flotation circuit. The molybdenum circuit is located within the existing Mill containment, except the dry molybdenum concentrate is bagged into supersacks in a new room with a new concrete containment floor constructed contiguous with the existing Mill building. The molybdenum plant is designed to process underflow from the first of two existing copper concentrate thickeners, reconfigured to operate in series, through a separate series of molybdenum rougher and cleaner flotation cells. Except for the addition of small amounts of fuel oil to enhance molybdenum recovery, the molybdenum circuit uses the same reagents used in the copper recovery circuit. Because of the fuel oil use, the 2005 minor modification added analysis for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) to the tailings monitoring requirements in the Permit. The molybdenum-depleted copper concentrate is returned from the molybdenum flotation circuit to the second copper thickener for thickening, drying, and shipment for off-site refining.

The molybdenum circuit can process an average of 800 short tons per day (st/d), up to a maximum 1,000 st/d, of copper-molybdenum concentrate to produce a separate molybdnite (molybdenum disulfide; MoS₂) concentrate in a small, dedicated
thickener constructed within the Mill building. The thickened molybdenum concentrate is dewatered in a separate small pressure filter prior to packaging in 2-ton super sacks for shipment and off-site refining. Based on average ore feed rates and grades, the molybdenum plant can produce approximately 5.3 dry st/d of molybdenum concentrate.

A minor modification was approved by the Division in June 2009, for installation of XCell™ (XCell) Flotation Machines (FM) in the copper concentrator circuit. The XCell FM, which have a unique impeller design, are housed within a new building, with dedicated secondary containment, located adjacent to the southeast corner of the existing Mill building, downstream of the existing concentrator circuit between the existing tailings splitter sump and the tailings thickeners. The XCell FM use mechanical means to enhance sulfide recovery from the existing tailings stream without the introduction of additional reagents. The tailings stream is not affected except for a further reduction in sulfide and associated gangue mineral loading.

A second splitter sump (splitter sump extension) was constructed to abut the downgradient edge of the existing splitter sump. Tailings flow is conveyed to the splitter sump extension through a 3-foot by 5.5-foot opening cut into the common concrete wall between the two sumps. The gravity flow of tailings to the splitter sump extension is controlled by two new dart valves. In the event of a pipeline failure, the dart valves will close in less than 60 seconds, limiting the total flow volume to approximately 31,000 gallons.

The single tailings flow of 36,000 gallons per minute (gpm) from the Mill is divided by a second splitter sump extension into two streams of 18,000 gpm each. The individual flows are conveyed with variable-drive pumps through 30-inch diameter rubber-lined pipelines into four XCell FM, arranged in two parallel trains of two units located downstream of the Pump House in the Flotation Building. Concentrate generated by the XCell FM is pumped via 3-inch diameter Schedule 40 pipelines to the rougher concentrate circuit in the Mill. Remaining tailings flow from the XCell FM is conveyed by 42-inch diameter Standard Dimension Ratio (SDR) 32.5 high-density polyethylene (HDPE) pipelines into the existing tailings conveyance pipelines and on to the thickeners.

The splitter sump is constructed on a concrete floor with a subgrade leakage collection and recovery system (LCRS) identified as MTSS-2 in the Permit. The MTSS-2 is backfilled with compacted aggregate. The vee-shaped floor of the MTSS-2 will direct any fugitive solution to a 4-inch diameter perforated HDPE collection pipeline, placed in the vee-trough, that daylights through a one-way flapper valve into the base of the Flotation Building that serves as additional secondary containment. The Pump House, a curbed apron constructed of reinforced concrete, and the Flotation Building are hydraulically linked and constructed with stemwalls to provide in excess of the required 110 percent (%) secondary
containment capacity. Building access doors are above any potential spill volume elevation and all concrete joints are constructed with waterstops and appropriate sealants. The MTSS-2 is inspected weekly and flow conditions are reported quarterly. The original splitter sump, which was constructed without leak detection and cannot be practically retrofitted with a leak detection system, is identified as MTSS-1 in the Permit and must be drained, cleaned, visually inspected, and repaired as necessary, on a minimum annual frequency.

An engineering design change (EDC) Permit modification was approved by the Division in March 2013 to construct a SuperCell™ (SuperCell) Flotation Cell and associated tanks, piping, and secondary containment, located in a new building south of the XCell Flotation Building. The SuperCell Flotation Cell, which is several times larger than conventional flotation cells, was designed as a pilot test for the length of one year; however, the Permit does not impose time limits. The intent of the test was to determine if copper recovery can be improved from the tailings stream with an additional flotation cell. The SuperCell is larger in scale, but otherwise similar in function to the existing XCell FMs. Process flow is delivered to the SuperCell from the existing splitter sump extension via the XCell feed pumps. Concentrate from the SuperCell is pumped to the existing rougher concentrate sumps/laundered in the mill building, and tailings gravity feed back to the XCell flotation circuit for further processing.

The SuperCell Building foundation is constructed with native subgrade augmented as necessary with structural fill placed in maximum 6-inch loose lifts and compacted to 95% of the maximum dry density using the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Modified Proctor Test (Method D1557). The SuperCell Building is hydraulically linked to the XCell Flotation Building via a pipe channel with concrete secondary containment. All concrete seams in secondary containment areas are equipped with flexible waterstops to prevent leakage. The SuperCell Building has secondary containment capacity in excess of the required 110% of the flotation tank, which has a primary containment volume of 181,225 gallons. The SuperCell flotation tank sits atop 6-inch grillage beams to allow visual detection of leaks (monitoring point SCLD-1). Any such leaks will be evaluated during scheduled down time and repaired as warranted based on containment integrity and flow rate. An existing Permit limit for leak detection flow from tanks limits the flow to less than 150 gallons per day (gpd) averaged over the quarter and 50 gpd averaged over the year.

A separate EDC was approved by the Division in October 2014 for a pipeline to supply the SuperCell with process water from a header pipe located outside of the west wall of the tailings pump house. The SuperCell™ process water pipeline consists of a 10-inch diameter SDR 11 HDPE primary pipe inside a 14-inch diameter SDR 17 HDPE secondary pipe. The pipeline runs around the north and west sides of the south tailings thickener, crosses under a road (via a 24-inch diameter SDR 11 HDPE tertiary pipe sleeve) and over the SuperCell building.
secondary containment stemwall, where it connects to the SuperCell process piping. The secondary pipe is monitored for leakage flow where it daylights inside the tailings pump house. Where buried under the roadway, the pipeline bedding material and the random fill over the bedding material are compacted to 95% of the maximum dry density determined by ASTM Method D1557. The rest of the pipeline bed under the exposed pipeline is compacted to 90% of the maximum dry density determined by ASTM Method D1557.

Copper concentrate thickeners are located external to the Mill building with secondary containment provided by a 6-inch thick, outdoor concrete slab covering a surface area of approximately 18,200 square feet, with a 4.25-foot high concrete stemwall encircling the thickeners. Thickened concentrates are dewatered using pressure filters located in the Mill building, and conveyed to a covered and bermed concrete copper concentrate storage and load-out pad for transport to off-site smelters.

Two tailings thickeners, measuring 230 feet in diameter and designated ‘North’ and ‘South’, are also located external to the Mill building and are constructed partially below grade with individual leak detection systems that report to the tailings pump house. Each thickener base construction, from the bottom to the top, consists of bedrock/concrete, approximately 2 inches of bedding sand, and secondary and primary 60-mil HDPE liners separated by geonet. The geonet serves as the LCRS and each LCRS reports to three drain ports per thickener connected by a manifold to a single 2-inch diameter polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipeline discharge port at the mouth of each thickener tunnel.

**Mill Water Ponds:** The Mill Water Ponds typically contain fresh water, but are considered process components and are double-lined because they are located on the sulfide-rich Liberty WRD, which is constructed over the Puritan ALD, both of which have the potential to generate acid with the introduction of water should a pond leak to the environment. Freshwater stored in the ponds is pumped to steel storage tanks for use in the Mill circuit and to other tanks dedicated to potable water and fire suppression.

The Mill Water Ponds were constructed from a single excavation divided into two double-lined ponds by a 20-foot wide septum constructed at below-crest elevation. Each pond measures approximately 220 feet on a side, is 14 feet deep, and has a footprint of about 1.1 acre. Each pond has a capacity, below the dividing septum crest, of approximately 3.1 million gallons and each pond is individually leak detected.

As required by the 26 October 2010 Intera Corrective Action Plan (Intera CAP), an EDC was approved by the Division in March 2011 to reconstruct the liner system of the Mill Water Ponds, because leakage from the ponds was believed to be contributing to the Intera MIW flow. As part of the reconstruction, the existing
primary liner and LCRS geonet were removed but the original 60-mil smooth HDPE secondary liner was retained to provide a construction base and provide protection of the existing pond earthworks. The existing secondary liner was inspected and all damage repaired. The compacted subgrade was also tested and recomped to the original specification as warranted.

Excess moisture in the subgrade at the southeast corner of the South Mill Water Pond was noted during the reconstruction activities, suggesting potential leakage through the original liner system may have occurred. The original 60-mil HDPE secondary liner was removed and the area was allowed to dry and recomped to the original specification prior to construction of the new liner system.

The original LCRS sumps were removed and new sumps were constructed using coarse gravel backfill material encased in 12-ounce per square yard (oz/yd²) non-woven geotextile. The sumps are equipped with individual 10-inch diameter HDPE riser pipes located between the new secondary and primary liners for evacuation of collected solution.

All existing intake (24-inch diameter) and overflow (18-inch diameter) pipeline penetrations in the original pond secondary liner were abandoned by plugging and grouting, and were covered with a protective layer of 12-oz/yd² non-woven geotextile and a 60-mil HDPE patch welded to the original liner. As required by the Intera CAP, all buried pipelines external to the ponds were also excavated and reconstructed with secondary containment pipelines or rerouted above ground, except for a few locations where the integrity of the existing pipelines would be compromised by the excavation activities. As applicable, the pipeline secondary containments report to prefabricated concrete vaults equipped with prefabricated HDPE liners that allow the vaults to be used as LCRS sumps.

A new pond liner system was installed using the original 60-mil HDPE secondary liner as a protective layer over the subgrade. The new liner system was constructed, from bottom to top, with a 60-mil textured HDPE Microspike™ secondary liner, a geonet layer, and an 80-mil textured HDPE primary liner. The new liner system was welded to existing concrete embedment strips located at the east side concrete spillway of each pond. The 2-foot minimum freeboard elevation was measured below each spillway invert and marked with reflective tape on at least two sides of the respective pond.

A new intake pipeline for each pond was constructed through the respective pond embankment. The pipeline was constructed of a 24-inch diameter SDR 17 HDPE primary conveyance pipeline placed in a 42-inch diameter SDR 13.5 HDPE secondary containment pipeline. Each intake pipeline connects to the pond through a prefabricated dual-walled penetration box constructed of 1-inch thick HDPE plate. The outer wall of the penetration box is clad with a ½-inch thick HDPE plate.
which is tied to the pond liner system to create a continuous leak detection system on the pond side of the construction.

**Carr’s Pond:** Carr’s Pond is an emergency containment pond located immediately downgradient of the Mill. The primary purposes of Carr’s Pond are to collect any overflow from the tailings pump house, fluids from the Mill during an emergency event, and routine stormwater runoff from the Mill area and surrounding areas. Carr’s Pond also receives piped flow from the crushed-ore conveyor reclaim tunnel, located a short distance north of the pond, and piped flow from the Crusher Drive House sump, located uphill to the east of the pond. Carr’s Pond previously received solution pumped from the D-Pad heap leach barren solution pond (via the North Stormwater Shed vault), but that pipe is no longer connected.

An October 2013 characterization of sediment from the Crusher Drive House sump indicates that the sediment is acid neutralizing, contains less than 5 milligrams per kilogram TPH, produces a meteoric water mobility procedure (MWMP) extract that does not exceed any groundwater reference values for the Weary Flats Hydrogeologic Block, and exceeds only the manganese groundwater reference value for the Giroux Wash Hydrogeologic Block.

An EDC was approved by the Division in August 2014 to replace the original single-lined Carr’s Pond with a double-lined pond, and to construct the double-lined Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin adjacent to Carr’s Pond, in accordance with a schedule of compliance item that was added to the Permit during the 2010 renewal. With approval of the EDC, the previous 20-day limit for evacuation of any process solution above a minimum 7.5 feet of freeboard was eliminated from the Permit, and was replaced with a standard 2-foot minimum freeboard requirement. The new Carr’s Pond (2014 EDC) has a maximum capacity of approximately 2,776,760 gallons at the 2-foot freeboard level. The new pond was constructed during summer 2015 and commissioned in late 2015.

Per a 1997 as-built report, Carr’s Pond was originally constructed, from bottom up, with a soil subgrade, a 3-inch thick layer of compacted structural fill, a 9-inch thick unreinforced concrete slab, geotextile, and a single 80-mil HDPE liner that extends up the pond sidewalls to an anchor trench at the crest. The soil subgrade includes a network of approximately 2-foot wide underdrain trenches excavated to depths between 12 and 18 inches that are backfilled with ¾-inch nominal diameter gravel and covered with a layer of geotextile. The trenches were installed to capture shallow, perched groundwater encountered during construction. The underdrain trenches are graded at approximately 1% toward a drain-rock sump constructed under the north corner of the pond. The underdrain sump is evacuated via a submersible pump mounted inside a 20-inch diameter PVC underdrain collection pipe that daylights at the pond crest near the north corner of the pond (monitoring point CP-UC). Any groundwater pumped from the underdrain collection pipe is discharged into Carr’s Pond. During the 2015 new pond construction, the
underdrain collection system was evaluated and determined to be functional, but dry. Shallow groundwater also reports to the nearby ore conveyor tunnel and is pumped to Carr’s Pond via a buried pipeline that outfalls near the north corner of the pond (monitoring point CP-CT). The original 80-mil HDPE pond liner was removed from the bottom of the pond as part of the 2015 construction, but the concrete slab was left in place, except in the northern corner of the pond where a portion of the concrete slab was removed to make room for the new pond LCRS sump.

On the bottom of the new Carr’s Pond, a 12-oz/yd^2 geotextile layer was placed over the concrete slab to protect the new secondary liner. From bottom up, the new pond liner system consists of the geotextile mentioned above, a 60-mil smooth HDPE secondary liner, an HDPE geonet LCRS layer, and a 60-mil textured HDPE primary liner with textured side up. The pond bottom is sloped toward a recessed LCRS sump constructed under the northern corner of the pond adjacent to the original pond underdrain sump. The LCRS sump is constructed between the pond liners with ¾-inch-minus drain rock encased in 12-oz/yd^2 geotextile. An 8-inch diameter HDPE leak detection pipe is used to evacuate the LCRS sump (monitoring point CP-LDP). The pipe, which is perforated within the sump and solid above the sump, runs up the pond slope between the liners and daylight at the pond crest.

Carr’s Pond is designed to receive emergency overflow from upset conditions at the tailings pump house via a grated concrete overflow channel that connects the pump house to the pond crest near the south corner of the pond. Carr’s Pond is also designed to contain stormwater from the 25-year, 24-hour storm event. The pond receives stormwater from the main mill-site stormwater conveyance channel, which flows along the southeast side of the pond and discharges to the pond via the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin at the east corner of the pond. A 14-inch diameter HDPE pond inlet pipe, which is contained inside a secondary 30-inch diameter corrugated polyethylene tube (CPT) pipe for most of its run, connects Carr’s Pond to the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin. The inlet pipe is approximately 10 feet long and is graded to drain to Carr’s Pond. The inlet pipe is booted to the primary liner of the sediment basin near its upstream end. Where the inlet pipe and secondary CPT pipe penetrate the pond liners, the secondary CPT is booted to the pond primary liner. The buried southeast end of the CPT pipe is open, so any flow discharging from the CPT may be either leakage from the primary pipe or drainage from the surrounding soil. Carr’s Pond also receives stormwater from a vee ditch on the pond’s north perimeter (northwest and northeast sides) that discharges into the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin, and a drain-rock filled drainage trench on the pond’s southwest perimeter that discharges into the main mill-site stormwater conveyance channel near the pond’s south corner (upstream of the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin). Seepage into the Crusher Drive House sump is pumped to Carr’s Pond via a surface pipe near the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin. Another pipe conveys stormwater from the recessed concrete North Stormwater Shed Vault, located just north of Carr’s Pond, into the pond near its north corner. The North Stormwater Shed Vault
receives flow from buried pipes (north and west inlet pipes to the vault) that convey stormwater from low-lying sumps and a culvert located on the northern side of the mill-site. The North Stormwater Shed outlet pipe is booted through the Carr’s Pond primary liner midway down the pond slope near the north corner of the pond.

The main mill-site stormwater conveyance channel collects stormwater, plus any emergency process solution releases, from all but the northwest and north sides of the mill-site, and from further upgradient sources such as the truck shop and Riepetown Spring areas. Except for the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin, the stormwater channel is unlined and not considered containment for released process solution. On the southeast side of Carr’s Pond, the main stormwater channel is riprapped to decrease erosion and to protect the transition to the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin liner.

The Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin is double-lined with the same liner system as Carr’s Pond, except the primary liner is overlain with 12-oz/yd² geotextile and a 6-inch thick layer of concrete. The concrete layer allows the use of small motorized equipment in the basin to remove sediment without damaging the liner system. The uppermost 8 inches of the native subgrade under the basin is moisture conditioned and compacted to a minimum 90% of maximum dry density in accordance with ASTM Method D1557. The recessed LCRS sump for the Carr’s Pond Sediment Basin (monitoring point CP-SB-LDP) is located under the north corner of the basin and is similar in construction and method of evacuation to the Carr’s Pond LCRS sump.

**Tailings Pipeline Corridor:**  Tailings slurry is pumped from the two tailings thickeners, North and South, located at the Robinson Mill, to the 25,400-gallon tailings break tank via the tailings pump house and two 20-inch diameter aboveground HDPE pipelines. The break tank serves to break vacuum pressures within the pipelines and regulate gravitational flow of the slurry where the dual slurry pipeline system transitions to a single, above ground 22-inch diameter HDPE pipeline to the Choke Station. At the Choke Station slurry can be diverted directly to the TSF via the northeastern deposition pipeline or on to the Re-Pulp Station.

The Re-Pulp Station Pump House contains the slurry tank, sump pumps, and associated facilities. Tailings slurry is conveyed from the Re-Pulp Station to the slurry/header distribution system on the tailings impoundment embankment. The distribution system consists of an elevated header pipeline that can feed cyclones or distribution pipelines extending into the impoundment. During the winter or during operational adjustment periods, slurry can also be diverted to bypass the cyclones entirely for direct discharge to the impoundment basin via the western or southeastern deposition pipelines.

An EDC was approved, by the Division, in April of 2017, for the removal of the Re-Pulp Tank, Overflow Tank, and associated piping from the Re-pulp Building.
The existing 90-degree elbow was be replaced with a three-way manifold that will direct tailings to the cyclone headers or, in the event of a cyclone header malfunction, to a bypass that leads to the tailings facility. A new 24-inch diameter rubber-lined standard carbon steel pipe will extend from the tee to the southwest of the facility approximately 25 feet under the main access road. All road crossings will be excavated to ensure that there is a 4-foot minimum depth of backfill over the pipeline. The backfill will be placed in maximum 8-inch loose lifts and will be moisture conditioned and compacted to 92% of the maximum dry density determined by ASTM Method D1557. The buried section of 24-inch steel pipeline will be underlain by a leak detection system consisting of an 80-mil HDPE liner covered with drain rock or sand that has a 4-inch diameter perforated collection pipe placed at a low point in the flow line. The 4-inch leak detection pipe will daylight out of the slope below the access road for observation.

Below the main access road, the bypass pipeline will transition from a 24-inch diameter rubber-lined standard carbon steel pipe to a 24-inch diameter HDPE SDR 11 pipeline. The HDPE pipeline will extend under the lower access road inside a 30-inch diameter corrugated polyethylene pipeline sleeve that will serve as leak detection. The HDPE pipeline will then extend 2,000 feet north, along the lower access road, in order to deposit tailings away from the eastern embankment.

The existing 24-inch pressure activated valve will be relocated to the bypass side of the tee. This valve will be connected to a pressure sensor located on the tailings pipeline and will open when the pressure exceeds 85 pounds per square inch (psi) to protect the HDPE pipelines delivering tailings to the cyclone header.

Reclaim water is pumped into an above ground 24-inch diameter HDPE pipeline via the 50,000 gallon reclaim tank and booster station at the Re-Pulp Station to the reclaim break tank located near the highest elevation along the pipeline route. Reclaim solution flows by gravity from the reclaim break tank to the Mill circuit through a 22-inch diameter HDPE pipeline.

Beginning at the Mill, the tailings slurry and reclaim pipeline systems, including the break tanks and the Re-Pulp Station, are located within parallel earthen berms (minimum 2.5 feet high and a nominal 8-feet base width) that form the trapezoidal-shaped, pipeline corridor. In early 2001, and again in mid-2005, to address surface deterioration and erosion issues, the corridor containment berms were reconstructed as necessary with approved fill material and ram-compacted using a loader or excavator bucket. For the work in 2005, and all future work on the corridor containment berms, compaction specifications were established, which call for material to be placed in maximum 12-inch thick lifts and compacted to 90% maximum dry density, ± 2%, in accordance with ASTM Method D1557. The Division does not consider the pipeline corridor a “lined” component as it does not meet the minimum design criteria for liners as outlined in Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 445A.438. Therefore, any spills must be reported, evaluated,
quantified, and remediated in accordance with the approved Emergency Response Plan.

**Giroux Wash Tailings Impoundment (or Tailings Storage Facility [TSF]):**

Construction of the unlined Giroux Wash TSF was initiated in 1995. A starter embankment, comprised of compacted fill material, was constructed to an elevation of 6,710 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) and deposition of tailings was initiated directly onto a grubbed and contoured native soil subgrade. A 5-foot embankment crest raise was constructed in 1996 using compacted fill. Additional centerline raises to the embankment, for the life of mine (LOM), will be constructed utilizing coarse fraction cycloned tailings deposition and local compacted fill. The currently permitted maximum crest elevation for the embankment is 6,820 feet AMSL (except on the Eastern Embankment Extension and Western Embankment Extension; see below). Descriptions of specific aspects of the impoundment design follow.

In accordance with the 1997 Consent Agreement, groundwater flow and solute transport modeling was completed for the constructed Giroux Wash TSF. The “Groundwater Flow and Transport Subregional Model: Giroux Wash Tailings Impoundment, 15 October 1997”, was prepared to evaluate tailings water percolation through the unsaturated zone beneath the impoundment, to assess the potential for solute transport, and to assess the potential for degradation of waters of the State. HYDRUS_2D, MODFLOW, and MT3D96 codes were used for the model and three cases were evaluated: Case 1) 3,000 milligrams per liter (mg/L) TDS and 2,100 mg/L sulfate, the highest concentrations observed to date in solution samples; Case 2) 4,000 mg/L TDS and 2,400 mg/L sulfate; and Case 3) 5,000 mg/L TDS and 3,600 mg/L sulfate as a worst case scenario.

The modeling was used to predict flow and transport for 1,644 years into the future based on continued tailings deposition to the impoundment for the (1997) remaining 16-year mine life at that time. The model concluded that TDS and sulfate concentrations in groundwater will not exceed the respective 1000 mg/L and 500 mg/L water quality reference values at monitor well WCC-G1 if the BOC is maintained to minimize infiltration of tailings solution to the relatively shallow groundwater (approximately 250 feet below surface in the volcanic rock aquifer) and the BOC solution depth is limited to a maximum 15-foot depth.

In response to repeated exceedances of BOC limits for fluoride and pH, a more detailed update of the Flow and Transport Model was submitted on 13 March 2012. The updated Flow and Transport Model predicted for the first time that the TSF will cause localized areas of low-level groundwater degradation with respect to sulfate, TDS, and high pH under the TSF footprint and a short distance to the south of the TSF. The Division responded in late 2012 and early 2013, requiring additional monitoring wells south of the TSF embankment, and a possible water treatment system to prevent further exceedances of BOC limits and to eliminate the
potential for groundwater degradation. Refer to the TSF Groundwater Contamination section below.

**TSF Embankment Construction and Header/Cyclone Deposition System:** The TSF embankment header deposition system, located along the crest of the Central Embankment, uses a 30-inch diameter rubber-lined steel pipeline mounted on vertical “H-frame” support structures, with 10-inch diameter cyclones, 4-inch diameter HDPE cyclone overflow pipes, 6-inch diameter HDPE spigot pipelines, valves, joints, vertical and horizontal supports and jacking system, and overhead walkway for mechanical system access. The tailings distribution system has been designed to accommodate a phased expansion of the tailings impoundment to an approved maximum embankment elevation of 205 feet above its base (6,820 feet AMSL), with a downstream slope of 2.5H:1V (horizontal to vertical). Embankment elevations above 6,820 feet AMSL or modifications to the approved TSF design are considered modifications to the Permit and would require Division review and approval prior to construction. Exceptions to the embankment crest elevation limit are the Eastern Embankment Extension, which was constructed in 1997 using a combination of native ground and engineered fill to 6,830-6,865 feet AMSL to provide the necessary elevation for gravity drainage in the tailings pipelines upstream of the header deposition system, and the Western Embankment Extension, on which the Division approved in July 2016 the construction of a tailings pipe support berm. To clarify this discrepancy and to provide an elevation limit that would apply to the Eastern Embankment Extension and Western Embankment Extension, the Division added a limitation to the 2016 Permit renewal requiring that the maximum approved elevation for the tailings beach on the upstream side of any section of the TSF embankment is 6,818 feet AMSL. The 6,818-foot AMSL limit for the crest of tailings deposition was previously established for the Giroux Wash TSF by the Nevada Division of Water Resources (NDWR).

The TSF Central Embankment is continuously raised, except during winter operations when the cyclones are bypassed, by deposition of the coarse tailings fraction separated by the cyclones and by periodically raising the TSF embankment header pipeline using the jacking system. Alternatively, earthen borrow material may be used to raise the embankment height, especially during extended freezing weather conditions when tailings cannot be cycloned. The fine tailings and water fraction from the cyclones is discharged onto the tailings beach on the upstream (north) side of the TSF embankment. The Central Embankment and associated cyclone header deposition system do not extend all the way to the eastern and western ends of the south embankment of the TSF; the Eastern Embankment Extension and Western Embankment Extension of the TSF south embankment are constructed entirely with compacted earthen borrow material over native soil and bedrock. During extended freezing weather conditions, when the cyclones are bypassed, uncycloned whole tailings slurry is discharged through 6-inch diameter
spigot pipelines from the western, northeastern, and southeastern deposition pipelines, directly into the TSF basin.

An EDC was approved by the Division in April 2008, for the LOM construction of expansions to the Giroux Wash TSF embankment to a maximum permitted crest elevation of 6,820 feet AMSL. The approved design includes lateral and vertical expansions to the western and eastern compacted earth embankments, an upgrade expansion of the BOC, and associated downstream expansions of the downstream underdrain, stormwater, and sediment control facility (DUSSCF).

The EDC approval requires notification prior to construction of any portion of the expansion and submittal of as-builds and updated operating plans following completion of any construction phase. In addition, the Permittee is required to conduct soil density testing of in-situ and compacted soils in the TSF basin finger zones when they are cleared and grubbed in advance of embankment expansions. Results of in-situ and flexible wall test results are provided to the Division as part of each as-built and QA/QC report, as applicable.

The 2017 Renewal and Major Modification consisted of, along with additional construction and source mitigation measures, the increase in the elevation of the main embankment to a height of 6,880 feet AMSL or 265 feet above the base. During NDWR’s review of the Application for Approval of Plans and Specifications for Alteration of a Dam, Permit No. J-413 (SRK, 2016) a third party review was requested due to the complexity of the TSF. The third party review determined that additional tailings characterization was required for the ultimate embankment height construction. A revised permit titled Revised Application for Approval of Plans and Specifications for Alteration of a Dam, Permit No. J-413 (SRK, 2017) was submitted to NDWR for permission to construct a 10-foot lift on the embankment while additional information was collected and analyzed for the ultimate buildout elevation of 6,880 feet AMSL. The 10-foot raise was approved by NDWR on 19 June 2017. The Division and NDWR must provide written approval of the revised stability analysis in order to allow for additional raises to the final elevation of 6,880 feet AMSL.

TSF Embankment Seepage Collection System and Sediment Control: A group of 10 vibrating wire piezometers (EP1 through EP10), installed in 1998 at 700-foot intervals along the TSF Central Embankment centerline at an elevation of approximately 6,715 feet AMSL (within or on the initial 5-foot raise above the starter embankment), are used to measure the phreatic water surface within the cycloned tailings to maintain embankment stability and monitor the recovery of these waters. One additional piezometer (EP11) was installed in 2006 within the compacted fill of the Western Embankment Extension. Recovery of water within the Central Embankment is facilitated by a drainage blanket located beneath the embankment and constructed of a geotextile-encased 18-inch thick drain-rock layer that includes embedded perforated and non-perforated HDPE conveyance
pipelines. The drainage blanket lies directly on compacted fill and native soil. Solution collected in the underdrainage system and conveyed to the Seepage Collection Pond may include meteoric water, process water draindown from the cycloned tailings, and/or seepage through the impounded tailings and the embankment. The purpose of this system is to accelerate drainage and consolidation of cycloned solids, which will provide dam stability and enhance containment of fluids. The Eastern Embankment Extension and Western Embankment Extension do not include underdrainage systems.

An EDC was approved by the Division in January 2016 for installation of nine additional TSF embankment piezometers (EP12-EP16, EP17a, b, c, and EP18) clustered into three groups drilled from the embankment crest into the cycloned tailings, and in some cases into the underlying starter embankment and native soil. Each piezometer is a grouted borehole containing one or more 2-foot vertical intervals of bedding sand each enclosing a single Geokon vibrating wire pressure transducer. The three piezometer clusters may each include one vertical piezometer equipped with up to three transducers at three different depths (e.g., EP17a, b, c), one piezometer equipped with one transducer inclined northward toward the TSF basin, and one piezometer equipped with one transducer inclined southward toward the downstream toe of the embankment. The new piezometers were installed to provide a more accurate understanding of the phreatic surface within the embankment, both for stability evaluation and design of possible future embankment raises. The piezometers may also provide supporting information for the ongoing investigation on TSF leakage to groundwater. The piezometers were installed in January and February 2016.

In late May 2016, a 0.8 gpm flow of tailings solution was observed emanating from a small area of tuffaceous bedrock in a road-cut exposure immediately downslope of the downstream face of the Eastern Embankment Extension. Tailings spigotting was temporarily curtailed on the adjacent upstream side of the embankment, a temporary 60-mil HDPE-lined collection sump was installed, and the seepage rates immediately decreased.

In early June 2016, the Division approved a non-fee modification for a permanent Eastern Embankment Extension seep collection system, and the installation of five additional vibrating wire piezometers. The piezometers were installed within the Eastern Embankment Extension, the underlying bedrock, and the adjacent tailings beach to investigate the phreatic surface in those materials near the seep. The seep collection system includes a cut-off trench that terminates in a sump, from which the collected seepage is pumped back to the TSF through a pipeline equipped with a totalizing flow meter. The cut-off trench is 2- to 3-feet deep and 2-feet wide, and is lined on its bottom and south wall with a 60-mil HDPE geomembrane. The cut-off trench is backfilled with limestone drain rock that is encapsulated within 8 oz/yd² non-woven geotextile. The geotextile and drain rock surround a 4-inch diameter, perforated, corrugated, polyethylene (CPE) collection pipe that reports to
the pump sump. The pump sump is also lined with a 60-mil HDPE geomembrane on its base and 1H:1V-sloped walls.

With the June 2016 Division approval, monitoring and reporting requirements were added to the Permit for the Eastern Embankment Extension seep (e.g., pumped seepage volumes, seepage analyses, piezometric heads, and TSF embankment seep reports). Future tailings deposition must be performed in such a way as to minimize embankment seepage and maintain embankment stability while maintaining a beach sloped away from the upstream side of the embankment in any embankment seep area.

The Seepage Collection Pond, located a short distance south of the TSF embankment, is constructed with a single 60-mil HDPE liner. The solution from the TSF underdrainage system that flows into the pond is pumped back to the Reclaim Water Booster Tank at the Re-Pulp Station via an above-ground pipeline from three vertical sump pumps for reuse in the Mill. Under normal operating conditions, the pond cannot be pumped below an approximate 2-foot depth, which is the sump inlet invert elevation. An emergency generator is in place at the pond to operate pumping systems in the event of an extended power outage.

The DUSSCF serves to retain sediments carried by stormwater runoff from the downstream slope of the TSF embankment, conveys tailings solution from the downstream slope of the embankment to the underdrainage system, and provides a collection system for potential upsets from the tailings header components. This unlined sediment control system consists of settling basins or paddocks underlain by a southward extension of the embankment underdrainage blanket and perforated piping system, and pre-cast concrete (or perforated CPE) vertical inlet structures to decant clarified solution from the settling basin underdrainage system. The clarified solution flows from the vertical decant structures into either solid HDPE pipelines or a 60-mil HDPE-lined collection ditch that convey the solution to the Seepage Collection Pond for return and use in the process circuit.

The DUSSCF is typically extended southward annually to accommodate the annual southward progradation of the TSF downstream embankment toe. The 2015 as-built indicates that the DUSSCF was extended approximately 75 feet to the south. From bottom up, the 2015 DUSSCF paddock construction consists of subgrade (and random fill where needed) compacted to 92% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557), a bottom layer of 10 oz/yd² nonwoven geotextile, an 18-inch thick underdrainage blanket constructed with clean drainage gravel, a top layer of 10 oz/yd² nonwoven geotextile, and a 12-inch thick layer of graded cover material compacted to 92% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). The coarse tailings fraction from the cyclones at the TSF header system is deposited on top of the graded cover layer. An earthen dike forms the southern limit of the DUSSCF. The dike is constructed to a minimum height of 7 feet above the base of the underdrainage blanket using borrow material compacted to 92% minimum dry
density (ASTM Method D1557). Twelve- to 18-inch diameter perforated CPE underdrain collection pipes, installed within the underdrainage blanket, report to vertical 12-inch diameter CPE decant risers, which are placed periodically within the DUSSCF paddocks. Fifteen-inch diameter non-perforated HDPE pipelines connected to the base of the vertical CPE decant risers convey the underdrainage solution to the lined collection channels and onward to the Seepage Collection Pond.

TSF Operation and BOC: Except during winter months, cyclones on the TSF Central Embankment are used to separate a sufficient quantity of coarse fraction of the tailings solids (underflow) for Central Embankment raise construction. Typically, 18 to 25 adjacent cyclones are operational over a Central Embankment linear crest distance of approximately 8,200 feet. The fine tailings fraction and a majority of the tailings fluid fraction from the cyclones are distributed in thin layers through the cyclone overflow pipelines into the impoundment basin creating a tailings beach with a northerly gradient of approximately 0.25%. This subaerial deposition method can achieve maximum tailings consolidation and lowers the material permeability into the range of 1 x 10^{-5} centimeters per second (cm/s) to as low as 1 x 10^{-7} cm/s, depending on material type, grain size, and beach management. Tailings slurry deposition also occurs from the western, northeastern, and southeastern deposition pipelines to maintain an appropriate beach slope in those areas of the impoundment.

An EDC was approved by the Division in August 2009, for construction of an extension to the tailings western deposition pipeline. The original 20-inch diameter deposition pipeline functioned by gravity and could only deposit tailings to a point approximately 3,000 feet beyond the western end of the 30-inch diameter cyclone header pipeline. This depositional limitation resulted in difficulties maintaining the required 2-foot maximum supernatant fluid depths outside the BOC in natural “finger” drainages along the extreme west and northwest limits of the tailings impoundment. The capability to deposit tailings over a longer western beach enhances the ability to displace supernatant fluid from the collection areas in the natural drainages and direct it to the BOC.

The 2009 western deposition pipeline extension design consisted of a separate, approximately 12,000-foot long conveyance pipeline comprised of 12-inch diameter SDR 13.5 (first 2,000 feet) and SDR 17 (remaining 10,000 feet) HDPE, fed by a dedicated, skid-mounted, slurry booster pump. The booster pump – a variable frequency drive design - was connected by a 14-inch diameter take-off pipeline to the main 20-inch diameter deposition pipeline, just west of the west end of the 30-inch diameter cyclone header pipeline. The pump installation, located on the Western Embankment Extension, included a pressure transducer to shut the pump down to prevent cavitation and pump damage when the inlet flow pressure drops below 3 pounds per square inch. A check valve on the outflow side of the pump prevents backflow along the distribution pipeline. A 2-inch diameter HDPE
pipeline, placed in a 4-inch diameter HDPE secondary containment pipeline to prevent erosion in the event of a leak where it is routed up the face of the TSF embankment, supplies gland water to the pump from the Giroux Wash TSF Seepage Collection Pond.

The 12-inch diameter western deposition pipeline extension is located along and inside the downgradient 2-foot high berm of the realigned access road that traverses the western and northwestern boundary of the tailings impoundment. Two-foot wide cut-outs in the road berm, placed at 100-foot intervals, allow any escaping fluid, in the event of a spill, and stormwater reporting directly to the road to flow into the impoundment basin. Several 4-inch diameter spigots can be used to distribute tailings into downgradient finger drainages. Strategically placed 12-inch diameter takeoffs from the deposition pipeline allow distribution of larger tailings volumes through multiple spigots if necessary.

An EDC approved by the Division in July 2016 authorized construction of a new western deposition pipeline tailings booster pump station at the west end of the Western Embankment Extension. The new pump station replaced the 2009 booster pump station, includes two pumps and pipelines instead of one to deposit more tailings in the finger drainages and BOC, and minimizes additional tailings deposition near the Western Embankment Extension where the tailings beach elevation is already near the 6,818-foot AMSL Permit limit. The new western deposition pipeline tailings booster pump station is located within the TSF footprint and is situated topographically lower than the adjacent embankment crest, so any upset or overflow from the booster pump station will remain within the TSF.

The 2016 western deposition pipeline tailings booster pump station includes a concrete pad, an approximate 42,000-gallon, rubber-lined, steel surge tank, and two pumps. The surge tank is fed by a 20-inch diameter HDPE pipe connected to the west end of the cyclone header pipeline. Construction of a 5-foot high earthen berm was authorized along the Western Embankment Extension to support the 20-inch diameter pipeline and facilitate gravity flow; however, the Permit still limits the elevation of the cycloned Central Embankment crest to no greater than 6,820 feet AMSL, and the elevation of the crest of the tailings beach adjacent to the inside face of any portion of the tailings embankment to 6,818 feet AMSL. The surge tank feeds a new 500-horsepower variable frequency drive pump, which is connected to a new 20-inch diameter SDR 11 second western deposition pipeline that extends 4,000 feet to the north around the tailings impoundment. As part of the 2016 EDC, the previous tailings booster pump will be relocated to the new surge tank to feed the existing 12-inch diameter HDPE western deposition pipeline. The 2016 EDC also extends the 12-inch diameter existing western deposition pipeline farther to the north to deposit tailings in the finger drainages and the BOC itself. The upper 8 inches of native subgrade under the 6-inch thick concrete slab that supports the surge tank and pumps will be compacted to 92% maximum dry density as determined by ASTM Method D1557.
The TSF tailings beach ultimately grades toward the supernatant collection facility known as the BOC, which is located at the northwest limit of the impoundment footprint. Supernatant fluid flows into the BOC where it is recycled by pumping through a 24-inch diameter HDPE reclaim pipeline for reuse in the Mill circuit. The BOC is a key design element for maintaining the depth of standing supernatant fluid at all other locations within the impoundment basin below the permitted maximum of 2 feet. As part of the 2016 Permit renewal, supernatant depth monitoring requirements were added to the Permit for selected areas of the TSF basin outside of the BOC and subsequently (as of the 2017 Permit renewal and associated modifications), areas outside of the Supernatant Collection Area (once constructed).

The trapezoidal-shaped BOC measures approximately 3,600 feet long, which includes a 1,250-foot final extension approved by the Division as part of the 2008 TSF embankment LOM expansion EDC approved in April 2008 and completed in late 2008. The BOC ranges from 10 to 15 feet in depth with 3H:1V sidewalls and a bottom width of approximately 150 feet. The base and sidewall soils are amended with powdered bentonite clay material to form a low permeability soil layer compacted to achieve a nominal permeability of $1 \times 10^{-6}$ cm/s with a nominal thickness of 12 inches. To further minimize the potential for seepage of supernatant solution through the compacted base, solution must be pumped from the BOC via the reclaim water pipeline to the Mill within 20 days if the solution depth exceeds 15 feet at the barge.

During the original BOC construction, three vibrating wire piezometers, P1, P2, and P3, were placed below the natural ground surface under the tailings basin adjacent to the mouth of the BOC at depths of 1-, 15- and 30-feet, respectively. The purpose of these piezometers is to monitor the rate of seepage from the tailings impoundment basin for comparison with results of a vadose zone hydrogeologic model that was used to simulate conditions within the impoundment and potential seepage rates in the vadose zone.

As part of the 2008 extension construction, several additional piezometers were installed along two roughly northeast-southwest trending section lines, located approximately 750 feet apart and perpendicular to the longitudinal trace of the approved BOC extension. On each section, three piezometers (i.e., one set) are located on the centerline of the BOC and placed at depths of 1-, 5-, and 10-feet below the amended and compacted BOC low permeability layer. Two other sets, located at the lateral limit of the section, i.e., the east and west edge of the BOC, each contain two piezometers placed at depths of 25- and 35-feet below surface. These additional piezometers, 14 in total, were placed to monitor hydraulic head and potential fluid migration beneath and lateral to the BOC. The piezometers are designated by set number and depth from northeast to southwest along the section.
For example, Set 1 is comprised of BOC1-25 and BOC1-35; Set 2 is comprised of BOC2-1, BOC2-5, and BOC2-10; etc.

The 2008 construction also included three piezometers (VSP4, VSP5, and VSP6) placed in a vertical arrangement at depths of 1-, 15-, and 30-feet below the native ground surface in a drainage located approximately 2,400 feet southwest of the P1-, P2-, P3-location. These piezometers are intended to measure potential vertical seepage in a finger drain area inundated with tailings and solution.

The 2008 phase of the LOM expansion was completed in November 2008. The as-built report for the 2008 expansion includes details for construction of the base of the BOC expansion with a series of ‘step lifts’ to minimize the frequency of pumping barge relocations along the channel and to maintain a more consistent solution depth below the barge. This design feature, reviewed and approved during construction, consists of constructing the floor of the BOC expansion in approximately 200-foot long, flat sections divided by a short section with a 3H:1V slope and 6-foot rise.

A 34,000-foot long trapezoidal stormwater diversion channel is located upgradient to the north and west of the TSF and the BOC to divert upgradient surface runoff resulting from the 100-year/24-hour storm event. The stormwater diversion channel is an earthen channel, which is not armored with rip-rap, according to the December 1994 Revised Design Report Addendum to the Robinson Project Tailings Impoundment Facility.

**TSF Groundwater Contamination:** In early 2015, groundwater degradation with respect to sulfate was discovered in new groundwater monitoring well WCC-G7, located a short distance south of the TSF embankment. The detected sulfate concentration of 711 mg/L exceeds the 500 mg/L Profile I-R reference value for sulfate and is believed to be the result of leakage from the TSF. On 29 April 2015, the Division issued a Finding of Alleged Violation (FOAV) and Order, requiring the Permittee to complete actions, which had already begun, to investigate and remediate the contamination, including implementation of a Giroux Wash Corrective Action Plan (Giroux Wash CAP). One aspect of the CAP is the installation of groundwater wells to delineate, remediate, and monitor the contaminant plume. Accordingly, in 2015 and early 2016 the Permittee installed 10 new groundwater wells in the vicinity (four pumpback wells and six monitoring wells). Another requirement of the Giroux Wash CAP is to reduce or eliminate the source of the degradation. As part of the 2016 Permit renewal, a schedule of compliance item was added to the Permit requiring submittal of a Permit modification to eliminate the potential for the TSF to degrade waters of the State. The Permit modification was submitted to the Division as both a Minor Modification (18 March 2016) and a Major Modification (08 December 2016), both are described below in *Minor Modification for Supernatant Management Facilities*
An EDC was approved by the Division in June 2015 for construction of the Giroux Wash groundwater pumpback system to convey contaminated groundwater collected in pumpback wells to the TSF Re-Pulp Station pump house Reclaim Head Tank. At the Reclaim Head Tank, the contaminated groundwater is combined with tailings reclaim solution and pumped back to the mill for re-use via the existing tailings reclaim pipeline. The Giroux Wash groundwater pumpback system features 2-inch to 4-inch diameter, SDR 11, HDPE pumpback well pipelines that each connect one groundwater pumpback well to the Giroux Wash groundwater pumpback booster pump station located south of the TSF embankment. From the pumpback booster station, the contaminated groundwater is pumped to the Reclaim Head Tank via an approximately 7,591-foot long, 10-inch diameter, SDR 11, HDPE pumpback pipeline (this pipeline design was later revised; see below). Each pumpback well pipeline is outfitted with a check valve to prevent cross-contamination between wells, a flow meter with totalizer, an isolation valve, a pressure gage, and a sample port. The main groundwater pumpback pipeline features five air vacuum valves, each installed at a local high point, five isolation valve and drain valve pairs, each installed at a local low point, and a sixth drain valve installed at the Giroux Wash groundwater pumpback booster pump station. A 35-gallon HDPE stock tank is installed at each air vacuum valve and drain valve to collect any spillage. The pumpback booster pump station includes a booster pump, a 10,000-gallon plastic tank (the tank size and composition was later revised; see below) that receives solution from the pumpback wells, and an 80-mil HDPE liner capable of containing 110% of the tank capacity. Under the liner the upper 8 inches of native subgrade is compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) and a 4-inch thick underliner layer of non-potentially acid generating (non-PAG) general fill is compacted to 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). Cut and fill areas under the pumpback pipeline are compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557), except at roadway crossings, where the pipeline is contained within a secondary pipe sleeve and buried at least 3 feet below the road surface in non-PAG general fill that is compacted to 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). Final slopes associated with the pumpback pipeline construction will not exceed an angle of 2.5H:1V. The groundwater pumpback pipeline was originally designed to convey up to 500 gpm, but was redesigned as described below with a maximum flow of 32 gpm.

Several supplemental EDCs were approved by the Division in 2015 to connect pumpback wells WCC-G7, WCC-G9, WCC-G10, and WCC-G11 to the Giroux Wash groundwater pumpback system, to reduce the size of the HDPE pipeline between the booster pump station and the Re-Pulp Station Reclaim Head Tank from 10-inch diameter, SDR 11, to 2-inch diameter, SDR 7 (reducing the maximum pumping flow rate, as noted above), and to change the booster tank size and
composition from 10,000 gallon plastic to an 8,000 gallon rectangular steel tank. The pumpback system, as modified, was commissioned in December 2015.

A non-fee application was approved by the Division in July 2016 to convert monitoring wells PW-01 and PW-02 to pumpback wells and connect them to the existing Giroux Wash groundwater pumpback system. Sulfate concentrations in those two wells had risen in prior months above the 500 mg/L groundwater reference value for sulfate. Each of the new pumpback wells is outfitted with the same valves, flowmeter with totalizer, pressure gage, etc. as the other pumpback wells. A 2-inch diameter HDPE pipeline conveys the pumped groundwater from each pumpback well to the existing tank at the booster pump station for pumping to the Reclaim Head Tank. The PW-01 pipeline is approximately 550 feet long, and the PW-02 pipeline is approximately 1,700 feet long. The booster pump has a rated operating range of 11 to 32 gpm by use of a variable frequency drive, and the addition of PW-01 and PW-02 is expected to increase the total pumpback flow from 14 gpm to approximately 18 gpm.

Additional monitoring wells WCC-G12, WCC-G13, WCC-G14R, WCC-G15, WCC-G16, and WCCG-17 were installed downgradient of the TSF to further delineate the extent of groundwater degradation. When the first saturated water level was reached, a temporary screen was placed and a sample was taken. The well was then drilled approximately 30 feet deeper with another sample taken. This was to determine the best location of the well screen and to ensure that the well would be able to have the largest impact on degraded water if it were turned into a pumpback well.

In an effort to obtain valuable subsurface characterization and water chemistry information within the Giroux Wash basin fill material, located south and east of the Tailings Storage Facility embankment, RNMC proposed to drill two additional monitoring wells, WCC-G18 and WCC-G19, pursuant to the EDC document titled *Engineering Design Change for Installation of Two Monitoring Wells* (submitted to the Davison on 03 March 2017). During a meeting at the Division offices, on 7 September 2017, RNMC agreed to perform aquifer testing on both proposed wells and a plan titled *Proposed Plan for Aquifer Testing for Wells WCC-G18 and WCC-G19 in Giroux Wash* was subsequently submitted to the Division outlining the aquifer testing procedures. The results of this testing will be utilized to further define hydraulic boundaries, which are important for the characterization of the paleo-channels and sulfate transport within the Giroux Wash. These documents were approved by the Division on 26 September 2017.

**Minor Modification for Supernatant Management Facilities (2017):** In a document titled *Giroux Wash Tailings Facility Corrective Action Plan, Amendment 1 (CAP)*, the Permittee noted that water entrained in deposited tailings and ponding water around the tailings perimeter could create a driving hydraulic head and potentially exacerbate seepage from the TSF. In an effort to eliminate the driving
hydraulic head and reduce potential seepage, the Permittee proposed the constructing of a Supernatant Collection Area (SCA) and associated decant structure that would gravity flow supernatant to a double lined and leak detected reclaim water pond (RWP). From the RWP, supernatant will be pumped back to the Reclaim Water Tank (RWT) and ultimately to the Mill facility. The SCA area will minimize the driving head of the supernatant by reducing the typical operating depth of the supernatant pool from 15 feet in the current BOC area to between 2 and 6 feet in the proposed SCA.

Barge Operating Channel and Supernatant Collection Area Permeability: The BOC originally consisted of an excavated channel approximately 15 to 20 feet deep, 150 feet wide and 800 feet long located in the northwestern portion on the TSF in the west fork of the White River Wash. The base and sides of the BOC were constructed using a 1-foot thick bentonite amended soil layer to inhibit potential seepage from ponded supernatant in the area. In the document titled Robinson Tailings Storage Facility Water Balance and Draindown Estimates (GSA 2016), submitted in the Major Modification (discussed in further detail below), it is determined that over 40% of the seepage could come from the current supernatant water above the BOC and finger areas and cyclone underflow deposition. In this study, hydraulic testing (utilizing a cylinder infiltrometer seepage meter) was completed on the side slopes and the floor of the BOC and a calculated hydraulic conductivity of $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ cm/sec was determined for the BOC area.

The SCA will be constructed in the northern most reach of the TSF in the White River Wash. The SCA is located in an area where low permeability tailings have been encroaching on the proposed site of the SCA since 2010 and has resulted in, according to the latest survey data, a tailings depth of approximately 25 feet. Tailings in the SCA were determined to have a low permeability due to the results of samples collected in a transect sampling procedure across the TSF. Tailings representative of the SCA floor exhibited greater than 70% fines, and thus constitute low permeability tailings. Based on the representative samples and permeability testing performed in the Robinson Tailings Storage Facility Water Balance and Draindown Estimates, the SCA is expected to exhibit a permeability of approximately $2.4 \times 10^{-6}$ cm/sec. When the depth of deposited tailing in the SCA increases to a depth greater than 50 feet, the SCA will reach permeability’s on the order of $4.7 \times 10^{-7}$ cm/sec.

Supernatant Collection Area Design and Construction: The SCA embankment (SCAE) will consist of compacted alluvium constructed to a crest elevation of 6,816 feet AMSL, and will be partially founded on the existing compacted access road forming the current northern boundary of the TSF. Alluvium material will be moisture conditioned, to within $\pm 2\%$ of the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 92% of the maximum dry density as determined by ASTM Method D1557. A geocomposite “blanket drain” will be placed on the crest of the existing access road that will be incorporated into the SCAE. Where the supernatant pool
contacts the SCA or perimeter embankments, a well graded material with a minimum of 20% passing the #200 mesh sieve will be used as General Fill for the embankment construction.

The SCAE is designed to provide adequate storage for the 25-year, 24-hour storm event and withstand the effects of the 100-year, 24-hour duration storm event falling on the TSF and associated watersheds. The SCAE will have a constructed crest height of 6,816 ft AMSL with a spillway constructed at an elevation of 6,813 ft AMSL. The 25-year, 24-hour storm event will require approximate 1-foot of storage below the spillway elevation leaving an additional 416 million gallon stormwater storage capacity along with an operational pool depth of 6-feet. The SCA is designed to have an operational pool depth of 2 to 6 feet and a pool surface area of 6- to 184-acres, respectively. The SCA will have the ability to contain approximately 600 million gallons of supernatant/stormwater up to the elevation of the SCAE spillway.

The SCA blanket drain will be placed on the flat portion of the existing TSF perimeter road. The blanket drains primary function is to drain tailings material and thus improve tailings consolidation and decrease the overall permeability of the SCA near the embankment. The blanket drain will consist of an 8-inch perforated HDPE SDR 11 collection pipe placed in ¾-inch drainage gravel wrapped in 8-ounce per square yard oz/yd² geotextile. The geotextile is overlain by 6-inches of filter sand that is overlain by 6 inches of minus-2-inch riprap. The filter sand was selected to prevent the geotextile wrapping from “blinding” with fine-grained tailings. The filter sand was selected using the National Resource Conservation Services (NRCS) guidance document titled *Gradation Design of Sand Gravel Filter*. A filter sand with a D5 (5% passing) greater than the 200 sieve was required to filter all base soils, even those with more than 85% passing the 200 sieve. An 8-oz/yd² geotextile was chosen based on geotextile filter requirements from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials to prevent filter sand from passing through the geotextile openings.

During review of the Major Modification (discussed below), the Division requested that Permittee line the downstream face of the SCAE to further mitigate seepage and increase overall stability of the embankment. The Permittee agreed to line the downstream face of the SCAE and plans on submitting this plan prior to construction of the SCAE. This plan will be discussed with the Division and the Nevada Division of Water Resources prior to the submittal of a final plan. An SOC item will be placed in the Permit to ensure that a plan is submitted, for Division Review, 90 days prior to construction.

**Decant Structure and Conveyance Pipeline Design:** The Decant Structure is designed to gravity feed supernatant water from the SCAE to the RWP via two 24-inch diameter, HDPE SDR 17 conveyance pipelines. The conveyance pipelines are placed on top of a 6-inch sand filter layer that lies above a layer of drainage gravel
with a 2-inch perforated leak detection pipeline that extends the length of the conveyance pipelines. The sand filter and leak detection are underlain by a 60 or 80-mil HDPE liner that spans the length of the buried pipelines. Supernatant fluid will flow into the two parallel U-shaped structures that will house stop logs that manage the flow rate into each pipeline. The addition or subtraction of stop logs from the decant structure will allow operational flexibility in times of high turbidity or Mill shutdown. HY-8 software was utilized for pipeline and weir hydraulic calculations. Based on the current maximum reclaim water pumping rate of 5,000 gpm the headwater depth over the top stop log will be 1.1 feet if only one decant structure is utilized and 0.7 feet if both decant structures are utilized.

Reclaim Water Pond: The RWP construction will primarily encompass cutting of native soils, foundation preparation, liner deployment, and construction of the double lined LCRS. The liner system will consists of a single sided textured 80-mil HDPE primary liner and a secondary drain or smooth 60-mil low linear density polyethylene (LLDPE) liner. If a smooth 60-mil LLDPE secondary liner is utilized, a layer of GSE Hypernet (or approved equivalent) will be sandwiched in between the liners to intercept and transport leakage to the LCRS sump. The LCRS sump will consist of 5 feet of drainage gravel wrapped in an 8 oz/yd² nonwoven geotextile that will lie in-between the primary and secondary liners. The sump will have a 10 foot by 10 foot base and 3H:1V side slopes that will extend from the base to a height of 5 feet. The sump will be placed in the lowest point of the pond ensuring that any leakage from the primary liner will report to the sump. The sump will be filled with gravel and have an effective capacity of approximately 9,500 gallons. The soil beneath the sump will consist of a 2-foot layer of bentonite amended soil that will exhibit a maximum permeability of no more than 1x10⁻⁷ cm/sec. An 8-inch diameter HDPE riser pipe will be located between the primary and secondary liners and will extend to the pond crest to allow for leak detection and fugitive solution removal. An auxiliary 3-inch diameter access port will be included immediately adjacent to the riser pipe to provide for future access if needed.

The stormwater volumes resultant of the 25-year, 24-hour storm event and the 100-year, 24-hour storm event falling on the RWP were calculated to be 194,000 gallons and 247,000 gallons respectively. The RWP was designed to have approximately 1.8 million gallons of stormwater storage provided between the maximum operating level and the pond spillway. The RWP was designed to contain enough supernatant reclaim water to feed the mill for 31 hours at a pumping rate of 5,000 gpm (totaling 9.2 million gallons). This measure was added in the event that the supernatant water from the SCA was to turbid for mill use, in which case stop logs would be installed and supernatant flow halted until turbidity requirements are met. In the event that turbid water makes it into the RWP, the bottom 5 feet (totaling 600,000 gallons) of the pond is reserved for sediment storage. The operational capacity of the pond is 9.9 million gallons and the ultimate capacity of the pond to the spillway elevation is 11.7 million gallons. In the event that the RWP becomes
overwhelmed, reclaim water will exit from the pond through a 30-foot wide, 12-inch deep spillway that will be constructed at the southeast edge of the pond.

**Reclaim Water Pumping and Piping Design:** The Permittee will utilize two centrifugal pumps, with one additional standby pump, to supply the Mill with 3,000 to 5,000 gpm of reclaim water. The three pumps (two for operation and one for redundancy) will be skid mounted on a geomembrane-lined secondary containment area constructed along the southern crest of the RWP. Three 12-inch diameter 100-foot long HDPE SDR 17 suction pipes will be utilized, along with a dry prime system, to transfer solution from the ponds to the pumps. Each pump will be powered by an electric motor equipped with a variable frequency drive. The discharge from each pump will travel through a 12-inch diameter steel discharge pipeline that will be equipped with a butterfly and check valve that allows for maintenance and backflow prevention. A header pipeline will connect the three pumps to a main 20-inch diameter steel manifold. The steel manifold will transition, through a series of reducers, to a 16-inch diameter steel pipeline where a magnetic flow meter assembly will be utilized to determine instantaneous flow rates and cumulative flow rates. Once the flow is determined, the pipeline will transition back to a 20-inch diameter steel pipeline through a series of reducers. The 20-inch steel pipeline will transition to a 22-inch HDPE SDR 11 pipeline that will travel to and terminate at the reclaim water tank.

**Stability, Seepage, and Settlement Analysis:** A slope stability analysis was performed on the SCAE to evaluate the factors of safety (FOS) associated with circular failures and to identify critical embankment sections within the Giruox Wash TSF Expansion. The stability analysis was evaluated using the SLIDE computer program. SLIDE was used to analyze the stability of slip surfaces using vertical slice limit equilibrium methods. The 2014 United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Seismic Hazard Map was used to determine the design moment magnitude and maximum credible earthquake (MCE) peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGA). The MCE PGA was determined to be 0.21 times the acceleration of gravity.

SCAE seepage and stability parameters were based on the materials characterization of the foundation soils, borrow materials, and tailings. Because of the variation in alluvial materials encountered in the geotechnical field investigation, representative composite samples were utilized in the stability analysis. The SCAE critical section was determined to be at the highest embankment elevation and the greatest depth of supernatant directly in contact with the embankment. The SCAE critical section was modeled based on the first phase of construction (discussed in the submitted Major Modification) with an embankment elevation modeled at 6,831 ft AMSL, which is a conservative estimation for the proposed Minor Modification construction elevation of 6,816 ft AMSL.
The steady state seepage model was performed assuming the supernatant pool level was up to the spillway elevation of 6,829 ft AMSL and that the tailings were at their lowest anticipated elevation of 6,810 ft AMSL. A no-flow boundary was assumed at the bottom of the model to drive the phreatic surface up to the surface, at the toe of the embankment. A toe drain, 5 feet deep with a 3-foot wide base and 1.5H:1V side slopes, was modeled at the toe of the Phase 1 construction for both operational and surcharge elevations. The steady state seepage model was analyzed for both the operational and maximum surcharge pool elevation for each of the four borrow material types. Results determined that a maximum flow rate of 19.3 cubic feet per day is expected to enter the toe drain.

The conclusion of the stability and steady state seepage analysis is that all borrow materials are suitable for construction, except for soils with low cohesion that produce the lowest factors of safety. Construction of the SCAE will include the installation of a toe drain; general fill, for embankment construction along areas where supernatant will come into contact with the embankment, will consist of a minimum 20% passing the #200 mesh sieve; borrow materials with a low fines content will be blended or amended with another soil type and tested before use as general fill; a maximum 6-foot deep operating supernatant depth will be maintained; and piezometers will be installed and regularly monitored on all embankments that could be in contact with the supernatant pool.

A settlement analysis was performed for both the RWP and the SCAE. During the geotechnical site investigation, refusal was achieved in test pits to the east of the RWP. This indicated that bedrock is relatively close to the surface. To make a conservative model, it was assumed that there was 100 feet of silty sand, which exhibits a lower elastic modulus than bedrock, resting on top of the bedrock. Because of the unloading of soils in the vicinity of the RWP it was calculated that the RWP area would heave, when empty, approximately 1.65 feet. The maximum predicted settlement at the SCAE (using the same input parameters as the RWP) is estimated to be 1.64 feet under the center of the embankment.

Stormwater Management: Stormwater retention basin volumes and peak flow rates for the 100-year, 24-hour storm event were modeled using the SCS curve number method and HEC-HMS software. The 100-year, 24-hour storm rainfall event was determined from National Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration (NOAA) Atlas 14, and was determined to be a rainfall depth of 3.02 inches. The peak flow calculations were performed using the SCS Type II storm distribution, representing high-intensity, short duration storm events, which are representative of storm events in northern Nevada. Precipitation losses were determined through assessments of Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) hydrologic soil-cover complexes at the project site.

It was determined that a North Retention Berm (NRB), a South Retention Basin (SRB), RWP diversion ditches, and a RWP culvert would be utilized to retain and
divert stormwater away from the RWP. The North Retention Berm will be constructed to the north of the RWP and have the ability to retain approximately 14 acre-feet of water that would result from a 100-year, 24 hour storm event on the upgradient watershed. The NRB will be constructed to a height of 6,818 ft AMSL and have an emergency spillway elevation of approximately 6,816 ft AMSL that will safely pass the predicted peak flow of 81 cubic feet per second at a depth of 1.2 feet over the crest. The spillway will be 20 feet wide at the base, 2 feet deep, and lined with 12-inches of riprap with 50% having a diameter greater than 8 inches. The SRB will be constructed from excavating alluvium and will have the ability to retain 8 acre-feet of stormwater which is greater than the required 6.4 acre-feet from the 100-year, 24-hour storm event. Triangular vee-ditches are designed around the outside edge of the RWP’s access road and have the capacity to sufficiently pass runoff from drainage subareas, and direct the runoff towards the SRB.

The stormwater volume reporting to the SCA was determined by a hydraulic analysis of the watershed subareas affecting the TSF, SCS curve number estimations, and calculation of design storm runoff reporting to the TSF from external and internal watersheds. The total estimated volume of runoff potentially reporting to the TSF from all subareas from the 25-year, 24-hour storm event totals 367 acre-feet. The SCA area south of the SCAE is able to contain a volume of 1,645 acre-feet between the operational SCA depth of 6 feet and the invert elevation of the emergency spillway.

**Major Modification for Giroux Wash Tailings Storage Facilities Expansion (2017):** In December of 2016, the Permittee submitted a Major Modification (prepared by SRK Consulting), to the Division, for the expansion of the Giroux Wash TSF. The expansion encompasses the vertical centerline expansion of the existing embankments using the same methods previously employed, as well as the construction of new perimeter embankments to limit the lateral spread of tailings. The primary objectives of the TSF expansion are to provide engineered source control to minimize seepage losses from the TSF impoundment and to provide storage for the deposition of tailings material through the projected end of mine life in 2026. The expansion of the TSF will allow for the additional storage of approximately 205 million tons of tailings material, bringing the ultimate storage capacity of the Giroux Wash TSF to greater than 405 million tons.

The original version of the Major Modification for Giroux Wash Tailings Facilities Expansion was sent to both the Division and NDWR. The NDWR application was for the approval of plans and specifications for alteration of Dam Permit No. J-413 that was associated with the Giroux Wash Facility Expansion. Due to the complexity of the proposed modifications, a third party reviewer was requested to review the submitted analysis. Golder Associates (Golder) comments (titled *KGHM Robinson Giroux Wash Tailings Storage Facility, Independent Third Party Review*) on the Slope Stability, Liquification, and Stability Analysis were adopted in their
entirely by NDWR and a second version of the report was submitted to the Division and NDWR in response to the third party comments. Additional detail was added to the report to respond to third party review comments. Most of the analysis demonstrated that the proposed embankments would remain stable under the conservative assumptions of the original report; however, additional site characterization was required. Until the additional site characterization is completed, the expansion of the facilities, under dam Permit J-413 and Water Pollution Control Permit NEV0092105, is limited to the 2017 construction which includes raising of the Cycloned Main Embankment (CME) to an elevation of 6,830 feet AMSL and the associated grading of the perimeter embankments to the SCAE at an elevation of 6,816 feet AMSL.

The Giroux Wash TSF, as previously stated, was not designed or constructed to meet the minimum design criteria for tailings facilities pursuant to NAC 445A.437. The TSF was initially designed to store more than 200 million tons of tailings with an average deposition rate of 48,000 tons per day. Based on periodic exceedances of fluoride concentrations in the BOC chemistry, the Permittee agreed to complete an updated flow and transport model to better assess the potential for groundwater degradation. The updated model (submitted to the Division in 2012) predicted higher sulfate concentrations in compliance well WCC-G1R than was previously predicted in the 1997 model. On 02 June 2014, the Division required the installation of two additional monitoring wells WCC-G6 and WCC-G7. These wells were to be located 2,000 feet west and 1,000 feet east, respectively, of the existing monitoring well WCC-G5. In November of 2014, sulfate was measured in WCC-G7 at 711 mg/L and resulted in the Permittee’s submittal of a CAP and the Divisions issuance of the 29 April 2015 FOAV and Order.

The initial CAP focused on delineating the spatial distribution of sulfate in groundwater, the development of a reliable estimate of the hydraulic properties of the Giroux Wash, and identifying geologic features that control the direction and velocity of groundwater flow. A subsequent CAP amendment (CAP Amendment I) focused on the monitoring, mitigation, and sulfate source control. The CAP Amendment I achieved this through geophysics and monitoring well installation, development of a pump back well system, and the development of a tailings water balance. An additional CAP amendment (CAP Amendment II) described the ongoing and planned corrective, monitoring, and investigate activities. All pertinent information from the CAP findings were incorporated into the source control engineering design associated with the submitted Major Modification. As of the 2017 renewal, the CAP Amendment III has been submitted to the Division and is currently under review.

The Major Modification addresses construction and operation of the expanded TSF by incorporating: phased vertical expansion of the existing embankments; perimeter starter embankment construction, followed by phased vertical expansion; phased construction of a bentonite-amended soil layer over accessible native soil
within the expanded TSF footprint; phased construction of the CME DUSSCF; replacement of the existing pumps at the seepage collection pond and extension of the existing seepage collection pond pipeline to the Reclaim Water Tank; conversion of the SCP to a double-geomembrane lined pond with a leakage collection and recovery system; tailings deposition management via controlled deposition to achieve the maximum generation of supernatant water; deposition form the main embankments to achieve a beach gradient of around 0.25% towards the SCA; thin-layer, “sub-aerial” deposition of tailing material resulting in an upward “bleeding” of water entrained in tailings; and cyclical deposition of tailings to maintain the beachhead gradient from east and west abutments to the center of the CME and ultimately to the SCA.

Tailings Facility Expanded Embankment Construction: Raising of the CME will consist of, as previously raised, the deposition of cycloned coarse-fraction tailings underflow onto the impoundment crest, with the cyclone overflow being spigoted onto the beachhead approximately 60 feet out from the cyclones. The coarse fraction underflow will be regularly regraded by a small dozer to ensure a crest width of 40-feet. Both the Western Perimeter Embankment (WEE) and Eastern Embankment Extension (EEE) will be raised from the existing permitted elevation of 6,820 feet AMSL, to an elevation of 6,880 feet AMSL. This will be accomplished by phased centerline expansions utilizing compacted alluvium material. The alluvium will consist of material with 100% passing the 6-inch sieve, be placed in 12-inch loose lifts, and will be moisture condition, to within ± 2% of the optimum moisture content, and compacted to 92% of the maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D1557. Construction elevation targets for the CME, WEE, and EEE expansions are a Phase 1 elevation of 6,848 feet AMSL, a Phase 2 elevation of 6,860 feet AMSL, and a Phase 3 elevation of 6,880 feet AMSL. Phase 1 is further broken down into three sub-phases, Phase 1a, Phase1b, and Phase1c, constructed to elevations of 6,830, 6,840, and 6,848 feet AMSL, respectively.

The Western Perimeter Embankment (WPE), Eastern Perimeter Embankment (EPE), and the SCAE, will be raised from the existing original ground centerline and include a starter embankment constructed of alluvium. The alluvium will consist of material with 100% passing rate through a 6-inch sieve, placed in 12-inch loose lifts, and moisture conditioned to within ± 2% of the optimum moisture content and compacted to a minimum of 92% of the maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D1557. The Phase 1a construction elevations for the WPE and EPE will vary from 6,830 feet AMSL to an elevation of 6,816 feet AMSL in the area of the SCAE. Ultimately the Phase 3 build out elevation of the SCAE will be 6,870 feet AMSL.

Benching and the removal of unsuitable foundation materials will be utilized in the construction of the embankments. Benching will be utilized to ensure proper subgrade preparation prior to lift placement during centerline raising of the earthen embankment sections. Areas within the expanded TSF footprint were determined
to have unsuitable material for foundation construction. Where the unsuitable material is discovered, consultation between the engineer on site, the construction quality assurance personnel, and the contractor will determine the depth to which the material will be over-excavated. This is currently estimated at approximately 5 to 10 feet, depending on the location.

Slope Stability, Liquefaction and Settlement Analysis: A geotechnical site characterization was performed during the initial stages of the TSF expansion design project. The geotechnical site characterization consisted of the development of a conceptual facility footprint that was used to develop the drilling and near-surface soil sampling programs. Twenty-three drill holes were completed in the proposed footprint of the CME, WEE, EEE, and the existing perimeter access road embankment. Based on the results of the embankment subgrade geotechnical investigation four representative samples were selected and used in the stability analysis.

A test pit program consisting of 27 excavated test pits spatially distributed outside of the footprint of the proposed EPE and WPE was completed to characterize the potential borrow materials for the expansion. Nineteen-samples were index tested utilizing the Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM Method D422/C136) and Atterberg Limits (ASTM D4318). Four representative samples were chosen to represent alluvial soils across the site. Additional testing consisted of modified proctor compaction testing (ASTM D1557), remolded large-scale direct shear testing based on the modified proctor result (ASTM D3090-M), and flexible wall permeability testing (ASTM D5084-02 Method 3). Based on alluvial material encountered in the field and composite samples, each of the four composite samples were utilized in the stability analysis.

Tailings within the Giroux Wash TSF were characterized by utilizing a California split spoon sampler during the installation of seven boreholes. An onsite engineer logged the variations in moisture content and tailings gradation. A total of 86 samples were collected and subject to dry density and moisture testing (ASTM D2937 or D1557). Five representative samples were selected for copper tube triaxial shear testing and three for flexible wall permeability testing. Based on the results of the field and laboratory testing, tailings materials closest to the CME (highest chance of liquefaction during a seismic event) were identified as cyclone tailings from the cyclone underflow and a transition zone comprised of interbedded layers of cyclone overflow and spigoted whole tailings. The cyclone tailings shear strength was based on the results of the lowest shear strength for cyclone tailings tested and transition zone tailings were assumed to have an undrained shear strength based on the lower bound for fine grained materials and tailings. Tailings in contact with the Eastern and Western Perimeter Embankments and SCAE were modeled with a shear strength of zero.
SRK completed a seismic hazard analysis using the Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis (PSHA) method. This method uses the Poisson Probability Model to estimate ground accelerations expressed as a percent chance of exceedence for a given time period. The probabilistic seismic hazard was obtained from U.S. Geologic Survey Earthquake Hazard Program with seismic motions expressed as a function of acceleration due to gravity. The MCE and PGA were modeled with an equivalent recurrence interval of 2,475 years, equating to a MCE PGA determined to be 0.210 times the acceleration of gravity. Most of the new analysis (submitted in response to third party comments) demonstrated the proposed expanded facility exceeded minimum required factors of safety. However, as stated above, the TSF is limited to the proposed 2017 construction. Once the additional site characterization is completed, the model will be revised with the additional information.

To further increase site characterization, an EDC was submitted to the Division on 08 May 2017 for the addition of 62 piezometers along the CME, the beach up-gradient of the WEE, at the intersection of the WEE and CME, at the intersection of the EEE and the CME, and along the access road at the White River Wash. Geokon 4500S vibrating wire piezometers were selected and will be installed using a cone penetration rig. Once these piezometers are installed, monitoring will be submitted to the Division quarterly.

**Stormwater Management**: As stated in the Minor Modification (described above), the total estimated volume of runoff potentially reporting to the TSF from all subareas from the 25-year, 24-hour storm event totals 367 acre-feet. The SCA area south of the SCAE is able to contain a volume of 1,645 acre-feet between the operational SCA depth of 6 feet and the invert elevation of the emergency spillway. As the TSF expands vertically, run-on will continue to decrease as the areas allowing run-off to enter the TSF are minimized. The same configuration, outlined in the Minor Modification above, will be maintained throughout the expansion of the facility, ensuring that the TSF will be able to handle the designed storm events.

**Bentonite Amended Soil-Liner**: In response to concerns expressed by the Division during an 18 October 2016 meeting, the Permittee committed to phased construction of a bentonite-amended soil liner over accessible portions of exposed native soil within the proposed perimeter embankment footprint. The area lined will be phased (consisting of three phases totaling approximately 119 acres) such that areas that will remain exposed over the winter months will be minimized to ensure that re-compaction is not required. The bentonite-amended soil liner construction will consist of: clearing and grubbing of vegetation from the defined construction area; removal of borrow soil to the specified cut grade; scarify to a minimum of 12-inches, with the removal of rocks and deleterious material; amendment of soils with 3 pounds of bentonite per square foot of subgrade; and the mixing and compaction to a minimum of 95% of the maximum dry density, as determined by ASTM D1557, and moisture conditioned to between optimum and + 2% of the optimum density.
moisture content. Prior to inundation with tailings material, the bentonite amended soil layer will be tested and determined to have a nominal permeability of less than or equal to 1x10^{-6} \text{ cm/sec}.

This bentonite-amended soil liner plan, was incorporated into the Permit as an SOC item and is planned to be submitted, for Division review, prior to 22 December 2017.

Seepage Collection Pond: The Permittee proposed improve the seepage collection pond by extending the return pipeline to the RWT, replacing of the pumps to ensure that they will provide adequate head to deliver seepage collection to the RWT, and double lining the existing reclaim water pond. The existing pipeline, that currently pumps seepage back to the TSF, will be extended to pump collected solution to the RWT which will require the addition of approximately 1,600 feet of 14-inch diameter HDPE SDR 11 pipe. Due to the increased elevation of the return pipeline discharge to the RWT, the existing pumps will need to be replaced by 140 horsepower submersible pumps that will allow the ability for the pond to be emptied. Double-lining of the seepage collection pond has been added into the Permit as an SOC item with a design to be submitted, for Division for review, prior to 22 December 2017.

Eastern Embankment Extension Seep Drain: In response to a seep that that appeared in native bedrock beneath the EEE in May 2016, a seepage collection and containment system was installed. The seepage collection system consists of a seepage cutoff trench and a drain sump. The seepage cut off trench is approximately 2 feet deep by 2 feet wide and extended 20 feet upgradient of the surface expression of the seep. The trench is lined with a 60-mil HDPE liner on the base and downstream side slope of the trench. The trench is backfilled with 2-inch minus limestone wrapped in geotextile, with a 4-inch perforated CPE pipe placed at the base of the gravel to facilitate seepage conveyance to the sump. The sump is approximately 2 feet deeper than the cut-off trench and is 5 feet by 5 feet at the base with 1H:1V sideslopes, and is lined with a 60-mil HDPE geomembrane liner.

To account for the potential recurrence of the seep due to future deposition in the area of the EEE, the Permittee will convert the existing seepage collection system into a buried drain by implementing the installation of a dual-walled conveyance pipeline from the existing lined sump to a 1,550 gallon tank south of the ultimate embankment footprint. The Permittee will backfill the existing sump with 2-inch minus limestone drainrock, wrapped in geotextile, and place a 3-foot thick layer of drainrock, wrapped in geotextile, along the length of the seepage collection trench that will also extend from the trench to 5 feet above the seep expression. This conversion is anticipated to take place during the 2018 construction season.

Downstream Underdrain Stormwater Sediment Control Facilities (DUSSCF): The DUSSCF is comprised of a system of 13 paddocks that are drained by a 40 to 80-
foot wide, one-foot thick gravel drain that extends the entire length of the CME. The paddocks are designed to handle the 25-year, 24-hour precipitation event plus the estimated eroded sediments yield from mean annual precipitation on the CME. The Universal Soil Loss Equation was used to compute the sediment yields and the run-off depth was calculated by the NRCS Curve Number method. The results of these calculations are used to size the outer containment berm and internal paddock walls to provide the required DUSSCF containment capacity. Stormwater will cascade from higher paddocks to lower paddocks, through small spillways, in the event that the upper paddocks are overwhelmed. The required containment capacity of the east paddocks are 246,507 cubic feet and the west paddock required capacity is 336,455 cubic feet. The paddocks are designed to have an east paddock capacity of 636,336 cubic feet and a west paddock capacity of 609,425 cubic feet. Please refer to Fact Sheet section TSF Embankment Seepage Collection System and Sediment Control for greater detail on DUSSCF design.

**Tailings Deposition:** Short-term and long-term deposition objectives were developed as one of the critical components of the Giroux Wash TSF expansion. The short-term objectives consist of the deposition of tailings with a solid to water ratio of 48:52 during non-cycloning periods, the maintenance of a 0.25% beachhead gradient toward the SCA, and construction of the first phase of the embankment construction (6,830 ft AMSL). The long-term tailings depositional goals consist of maintaining a 0.25% beach gradient towards the SCA utilizing cyclical deposition from the Cyclone Headers and various spigots throughout the TSF. Based on a deposition rate of approximately 50,000 tons per day and an average slurry density of 85 to 90 pounds per cubic foot (pcf), the average rates of rise will vary from 5 to 6 feet per year.

The Major Modification incorporates the addition of a tailings booster pump, in the Repulp Station, to increase head in the tailings pipeline leading to the cyclone headers. Slurry rheology testing was performed to determine the slurry viscosity, shear stress, and coefficient of rigidity for the Bingham mixture (tailings), to determine hydraulic pumping and pipeline requirements. Testing was performed at 35% to 45% and 50% solids weight concentration. The 50% solids weight ratio testing proved inconclusive and the parameters for the 50% ratio were calculated using the Fluid Flow 3.33 calculator for Bingham plastic using shear rate and shear stress data provided in the rheology report.

Hydraulic calculations for the existing pipelines conveying slurry flows for the TSF expansion were performed using FluidFlow3 Version 3.33 (FF3). The hydraulic grade line (HGL) for the conveyance of slurry at a rate of 10,800 gpm (45,000 tpd) and 12,810 gpm (53,425 tpd), indicated that a booster pump would be required to provide a minimum of 25 feet of head to increase the flow rate to the Permitted maximum tailings deposition rate of 12,810 gpm. The slurry booster pump will consist of a 400 horsepower pump capable of supplying 14,400 gpm of slurry with 50 feet of pressure head. The in-line slurry booster pump will be installed at the
Repulp Station and will include replacement of the existing 3-pipe system with a single pipeline from the Repulp Station to the cyclone header pipeline. The pump will be installed with a variable frequency drive to modify the pump speed as required due to the variations in tailings production rates and densities.

**TSF Water Balance and Draindown Estimate Report:** Conceptual and numerical water balance and draindown models were developed based on observations and findings in the field along with laboratory data and desktop analysis. The main objective of this study was to evaluate and quantify the potential TSF seepage rates for both operating and post closure scenarios. The TSF water balance model consisted of inflow components that represented a source of water to the TSF, primarily tailings deposition and precipitation, and outflows represented losses of water to the TSF, consisting of reclaim, evaporation, entrainment, and seepage. A field characterization program was completed to determine the physical and hydraulic property characteristics of the tailings. In-situ and laboratory testing were performed to measure the saturated and unsaturated hydraulic properties of different tailings types that have been deposited throughout the TSF operation.

The tailings stream flow rates were modeled to be dependent on the tailing slurry deposition rate, solids density of the thickener underflow, solids density of the cyclone underflow, cyclone split, and the overall mill efficiency. Both the north and south thickener underflow were averaged to produce monthly data that could be incorporated into the model. Tailings deposition from 1996 to 1999, when the minesite went into temporary closure, ranged from approximately 8,000 to 44,000 tons per day (tpd) with a percent solids weight of 45% to 50%. From 2004, when operations resumed, to 2015, the average monthly tailings deposition rate ranged from 30,000 to 54,000 tpd while maintaining approximately 36% to 50% solids by weight (approximately 9,220 gpm of water). Projected conditions were modeled for both continued operational methods and with the improved future operational methods that would incorporate an increased solids density underflow rate from 44.7% to 48% solids by weight (approximately 8,200 gpm of water).

Precipitation inflows were modeled as precipitation that fell directly on the impoundment and the embankments of the TSF and run-on from areas surrounding the TSF. The precipitation rate was compiled from daily measurements, at three weather stations (Giroux Wash Station, Robinson Mine Admin, Ruth COOP), from January 1996 to August 2015. The average annual precipitation rate from January of 1996 to August 2015 was calculated to be approximately 9.25 inches. Run-on was modeled based on the compiled precipitation data, the use of the Soil Conservation Service Curve Number method, and the calculation of the contributing catchment area. A curve number of 76 was averaged and applied to the catchment area. The estimated historic monthly run on to the facility was calculated to be an approximate yearly average of 120 gpm. With the vertical expansion of the facility, the average monthly run-on diminishes to an annual average of approximately 15 gpm.
Pump back occurs from two sources, the groundwater pumping wells and the seepage collection pond at the base of the embankment. Measured data from the groundwater pumping wells was collected from September 2014 through December 2015 and was modeled with an average pump back rate of 20 gpm. The average annual seepage collection pond pump back rate was calculated to be approximately equal to that of direct precipitation on the embankment.

During the temporary shutdown period from 1999 to 2004, both thickeners were drained of water on a monthly basis to perform maintenance. The maximum water holding volume of the thickeners was estimated from design drawings and was determined to equate to approximately 160 gpm sent to the TSF.

The amount of reclaim water pumped to the mill was based on data from January 1996 to June 1999 and October 2011 to December 2015. The missing data was populated by multiplying the amount of water sent to the TSF by a reclaim ratio that was determined based on monthly data that accounted for seasonal cyclone operational effects. The average annual reclaim rate between 2005 and 2015 was 1,980 gpm, ranging from 1,710 gpm to 2,270 gpm. With the expanded TSF and associated operational improvements, a 50% increase in reclaim pumping was modeled to assess potential seepage reduction efforts. Incorporating the 50% increased reclaim rate from 2019 to 2026 increase the average annual flow rate to the Reclaim Water Tank to 2,630 gpm.

Evaporation was modeled using a three-temperature model that is based on the physics of the full energy balance and was determined from local weather, reflectance, and thermal band data from Landsat satellite imagery. A total of 137 images, evenly distributed from 1996 to 2015, were selected to be used with the 3T Model. Using the 3T Model, 30 meter by 30 meter resolution images were produced of the actual monthly evaporation from 1996 to 2015. The monthly evaporation rate was multiplied by the area of the TSF at that point in time to yield a 20-year series of monthly evaporation volumes from the TSF. Average annual evaporation rates, between 2006 and 2015, were determined to be 40 gpm from the embankment and 2,340 gpm from the impoundment. A slightly larger evaporation rate ranging from 3,170 gpm to 3,670 gpm was determined for the expanded TSF model due to the higher moisture retaining characteristics of the fine grained impoundment tailings, presence of wet/ponded conditions, and the slightly larger area of the TSF (approximately 1,900 acers).

Entrainment of water within the tailings material was calculated using the moisture retention characteristics and dry bulk density of the tailings deposited within the TSF. The moisture retention and dry bulk density characterization were calculated based on areas of different tailings types and a laboratory testing program. The coarse-grained tailings associated with the embankment and beach areas were assumed to drain while fine-grained tailings were assumed to remain saturated. The
estimated annual impoundment entrainment between 2005 and 2015 averaged approximately 1,440 gpm, and the estimated annual embankment entrainment was determined to be approximately 70 gpm. The Projected entrainment for the expanded tailings facility was considered to have the same entrainment rate between 2005 and 2015.

In-Situ Hydraulic testing was performed on tailings material, in the current supernatant collection area (BOC), and the alluvium that the TSF is constructed above. Tests were performed on the tailings material using an array of permeability measuring equipment in which the saturated hydraulic conductivity ($K_{sat}$) measurements range from $3.7 \times 10^{-3}$ cm/sec to $3.8 \times 10^{-6}$ cm/sec, and decreased exponentially as a function of increasing fines content. The geometric mean $K_{sat}$ ranged from $2.1 \times 10^{-3}$ cm/sec (tailings with less than 30% fines) to $1.9 \times 10^{-5}$ cm/sec (tailings with greater than 70% fines). Testing was performed on the sidewall and floor of the BOC and resulted in a weighted flux rate of $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ cm/sec. Alluvium around the perimeter of the TSF displayed $K_{sat}$ between $5.9 \times 10^{-4}$ cm/sec to $1.8 \times 10^{-5}$ cm/sec, with a geometric mean of $1.3 \times 10^{-4}$ cm/sec.

Laboratory rigid wall and triaxle flex-wall hydraulic conductivity testing was performed on composited samples and different bulk densities to simulate tailings depths ranging from 75 to 250 feet below the ground surface. Estimates of alluvium $K_{sat}$ were taken from GSA (2015) for depths of 100 to 500 feet below the ground surface. The testing data indicates that $K_{sat}$ decreases with larger percent fines and an increased tailings depth. Seven composite samples were compacted to low and high bulk densities to correspond to tailings depths of 75 to 250 feet below the ground surface. The measured van-Genuchten model predicted unsaturated hydraulic conductivity function matched well with the optimized van-Genuchten model. Results show that low bulk density samples tend to have higher saturated water contents and drain at less negative soil water potential than shown in the higher bulk density samples.

The amount of water available for seepage was determined by the difference of the inflows minus the outflows. From 1996 to 1999, it was estimated that the seepage rate increased from 1,480 gpm to 2,010 gpm. During the temporary closure, from 1999 to 2004, the seepage rate decreased from 2,010 to 980 gpm. Between 2005 and 2015 the seepage rate from the impoundment was variable and ranged from 2,500 to 4,500 gpm. The projected potential seepage rate from the tailings facility, without operational improvements, was determined to decrease through time from 2,980 to 2,600 gpm, due to the increased consolidation of tailings and an increased evaporation rate due to a larger surface area. The expanded TSF with increased reclaim ratio and increased tailings solids ratio from the thickener underflow results in further reduction of potential seepage. By the year 2026 the predicted annual average potential seepage rate decreases from 3,010 gpm to 1,330 gpm (averaging between 1,000 and 2,500 gpm). This seepage model, and associated results, did not account for the bentonite amendment of the alluvial soils in the expansion areas.
prior to inundation by tailings material or the synthetic liner placement on the
downstream face of the SCAE. These measures will further decrease the seepage
rate and will be captured in the next update of the model.

At closure, drain down seepage was simulated to decline exponentially with time,
with a predicted seepage rate at closure of approximately 3,000 gpm (seepage rate
of 2,600 gpm from tailing plus 410 gpm from the embankment). Within 10 years
the majority of the tailings become unsaturated and simulated seepage rates ranged
from 500 gpm to 700 gpm for the 2019 and 2027 closure scenarios, respectively.
The predicted drain down rate at 100 years will steadily approaching long-term net
infiltration rates ranging between 40 and 45 gpm.

Groundwater Fate and Transport Model: The water balance analysis (completed by
Geosystems Analysis (GSA)) provided the initial upper boundary condition for the
groundwater fate and transport model. WSP/Parsons Brinkerhoff (WSP-PB, 2016)
prepared a detailed groundwater fate and transport model to determine the potential
impacts to groundwater that may result from the expanded TSF.

Data collection in the Giroux Wash was performed to refine the conceptual
hydrology of the Giroux Wash and consisted of: water level and chemistry,
hydraulic conductivity testing, geotechnical testing, attenuation testing, and gravity
and electrical resistivity geophysical data collection. Review and interpretation of
the collected data identified important new aspects of the hydrogeologic conceptual
model including: the presence of heterogeneous paleo-channels in the Giroux Wash
subsurface that play an important role in preferentially conducting seepage from
the TSF down gradient; basin fill alluvium in the Grioux Wash generally possess
low-hydraulic conductivity that is displayed by the result of the observed mounding
of seepage underneath of the TSF; extensional faulting resulted in buried grabens
and horsts in the subsurface and gives rise to preferential surface flow on the eastern
margin, further verifying the deposition of paleo channels; and that TSF seepage is
the largest component of the Giroux Wash groundwater balance.

The elements derived from the data collection with in the Giroux Wash were
applied to a local scale numerical model encompassing the TSF and a four-mile
area to the south of the TSF. Unsaturated flow was simulated using the Richards
equation and transport was simulated for six potential constituents that were
identified to exceed Profile I-R concentrations in TSF supernatant water that
collects in the BOC area.

Two scenarios were molded, one to evaluate the current TSF closure in 2018 and
simulation of the drain down 100 years after closure (2118), and one evaluating
conditions of the expanded TSF and improved operations until 2026 with a
simulation of the drain down after closure (2126). Model results indicate that there
will be no incremental groundwater quantity impacts as a result of the expansion
opposed to current TSF operations. Both models displayed groundwater
degradation in nine wells within the current monitoring well network, with exceedances of Profile I-R values for sulfate and TDS. The maximum extent of the 500 mg/L sulfate exceedance is not predicted to reach farther down gradient than monitoring well WCC-G8. However, the expanded TSF does generally increase the sulfate and TDS concentrations and lengthen the time of the Profile I-R exceedance. This model does not account for the bentonite-amendment of native soils within the expanded TSF perimeter embankments or the lining of the SCAE. Both of these measures will further decrease seepage and will be captured in the next update of the Groundwater Fate and Transport model.

**Interim Expansion Measures:** Due to the urgency for construction of the expansion to begin during the 2017 construction season, the Division gave approval, on June 01 2017, for the construction of improvements to the facility, in support of the Major Modification. The improvement construction consisted of raising the pipeline support berm and access road at the western end of the EEE, and the raising of several sections of the reclaim access roads, approximately 5-10 feet, in anticipation for future deposited tailings levels. All construction would be performed in accordance with the 2008 *Engineering Design Change Construction Approval Giroux Wash Tailings Life of Mine Project*.

In June of 2017, the Division gave approval of an EDC that allowed a portion Main Embankment to be constructed to allow for additional tailings deposition. Cyclone raising of the CME to an elevation of 6,830 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) would be accompanied by the construction of the proposed vertical expansion of the WEE and EEE to an elevation of 6,830 feet AMSL. The CME will be constructed with cycloned tailings, while the WEE and EEE will utilize construction methods outlined in the approved 2008 Life of Mine construction. These are the same specifications that have been carried forward into the 2017 expansion design. Tailings deposition will be permitted to an elevation of 6,828 feet AMSL to allow for the minimum required 2-foot freeboard.

Two additional EDC’s were submitted and approved, for raising the WPE and the EPE to ensure that there would be sufficient capacity to store tailings during the 2017/2018 winter season when construction become difficult due to the extreme winters.

**Ruth Pit Expansion, Water Management Facility Modification, and Historic Gold Heap Leach Facility Overdumping:** A minor modification was approved by the Division in April 2008, in preparation for resumption of mining and expansion of the Ruth Pit and construction of the new Ruth and Jupiter waste rock facilities. The approved activities also include the construction of certain new water management facilities prior to overdumping with Ruth Pit waste rock placed in accordance with the WRMP. New waste rock cover thicknesses will vary from 20 feet to 135 feet over the existing and newly constructed facilities.
New mining from Ruth Pit requires engineered final closure of certain historic mining components and water management facilities in accordance with the 1997 Agreement and an FPPC to be submitted to the Division for review and approval prior to overdumping. The design and status of many of the affected facilities is described in the sections of the fact sheet that follow.

The A-Pad, B-Pad, and C-Pad gold heap leach facilities, located in the eastern portion of the Project area, and the D-Pad (aka, Weary Flats Pad) located north of the Mill, were operated until 1994, when the addition of cyanide to process water ceased. Subsequently, fluids comprised of draindown solution, make-up water, and meteoric water, were collected in the individual process pond systems and recirculated onto the pads as part of a test rinsing scenario in preparation for removal of the spent leach material for placement in closure facilities. The test rinsing activities ended in 1998, except for B-Pad, which continued intermittently until about 2001.

The rinsing and removal closure scenario, developed and described in several earlier closure plans prepared in accordance with the 1997 Consent Agreement, was superseded with Division approval of the April 2008 minor modification to expand the Ruth Pit. The Tentative Plan for Permanent Closure (TPPC) included in the minor modification application indicates that the pads will be closed in-situ, as generally discussed later in this section. However, an FPPC of any affected component or facility must be submitted and approved by the Division prior to initiation of any closure or overdumping activities.

Final permanent closure was achieved at the end of 2010 for certain A-Pad, B-Pad, and C-Pad surface facilities, including all buildings and associated process components, and the C-Pregnant and C-Barren ponds, but excluding all leach pads, and the A-Barren and B-Storm ponds that were retained as emergency overflow ponds for the A-, B-, C-Pad-to-Mill Draindown Collection and Conveyance System. Final permanent closure of the A-Pregnant Pond, B-Pregnant Pond, and B-Barren Pond was initiated in 2011 and completed in 2013. A FPPC for removal of the South B-Pad was approved by the Division in January 2014 and implemented in 2014-2015, with Division approval of the final closure report in July 2015. Descriptions of construction aspects of these facilities are provided below for reference purposes. Closure information, such as FPPCs and final closure reports, may be found in the Division files and archives.

**Heap Leach Pad and Facility Construction:** The A-Pad was constructed over the Mollie Gibson ALD, which dates to circa 1958-1979, ranges from 155 to 270 feet thick, and is composed of high clay content, sulfide-rich, low pH waste rock and low-grade ore that was placed on limestone bedrock and leached with sulfuric acid. A-Pad was commissioned in 1988, with approximately 2.8 million tons of run-of-mine ore loaded onto the 26-acre pad in 12- to 20-foot lifts to a maximum height of 90 feet by the fall of 1991.
The B-Pad facility was constructed as two pads; the North B-Pad (also identified as B-I Pad), which measured approximately 650 feet wide by 1,300 feet long, and the South B-Pad (also identified as B-II Pad), which measured approximately 300 feet wide by 1,800 feet long, to create an approximately 30.5 acre combined footprint. The pads were constructed over the Hayes WRD, a mixed oxide and sulfide WRD, and the associated B-Pad process ponds were constructed over the Sax ALD. Both dumps are 1970’s construction, vary in thickness from 100 to 200 feet with an average of 140 feet thick, were constructed on limestone bedrock with no liner, and are composed of high clay content, low pH material from historic copper operations. The Sax ALD material is spent ore that was leached with sulfuric acid. The two B-Pads were also placed into operation in 1988. Approximately 5 million tons of combined crushed and run-of-mine ore were stacked on the two pads in 12- to 20-foot lifts.

The C-Pad was constructed over the Jupiter ALD (also known as the Ada/East Kranovich Dump, circa 1970’s), which averages 120 feet thick, with a range of 100 to 150 feet thick, comprised of high clay content, low pH, spent ore from historic copper operations that was placed directly on the underlying limestone bedrock with no liner and leached with sulfuric acid. C-Pad is triangular in shape, measuring approximately 1,200 feet on a side to create a footprint of approximately 26.4 acres. The C-Pad was placed into operation in 1989, with approximately 4.1 million tons of run-of-mine ore loaded onto the pad in 12- to 20-foot high lifts.

Separate carbon recovery plants were built at the B- and C-Pad facilities, while the A-Pad utilized a carbon recovery plant located in the historic Lone Tree Mill, which was located southwest of A-Pad and has been decommissioned and dismantled. Secondary containment for each of the carbon recovery plants consists of a curbed concrete secondary containment pad with sumps and pumps.

The A-, B-, and C-Pads were constructed with a 12-inch thick subbase using weathered, oxidized, clayey soil borrowed from the mine WRDs and mixed with imported clay. Records from 1994 report a measured permeability of 3.6 x 10^-6 cm/sec for the A-Pad subbase but no information is available for B-Pad or C-Pad. The subbase is overlain by 8-oz/yd² geotextile (12 oz/yd² for C-Pad), which is overlain by a 60-mil smooth HDPE liner. The synthetic liners are overlain with another 8-oz/yd² geotextile layer (12 oz/yd² for C-Pad) that is covered with 18 to 24 inches (48 inches for C-Pad) of crushed ore to protect the liner and promote solution drainage.

The LCRS design for all three pads incorporated the geotextile layer underlying the synthetic HDPE liner, which was described as a “continuous wick” that reported to a system of collection pipes to convey fugitive solutions. These collection pipes drained to the pregnant solution pond (A-Pad), a series of sumps (B- and C-Pads), and in the case of the B-Pad, separate LCRS return pipes. Based on the poor
operational history of similar LCRS designs utilizing geotextile as a fugitive solution conveyance layer, the Division no longer approves such designs and the functionality of these LCRSs cannot be accepted without field confirmation.

The A-Pad was constructed with one pregnant and one barren pond, although the barren pond was later disconnected from the fluid management system and sat idle for many years until it was repurposed as the A-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond associated with the 2008 Ruth Pit expansion minor modification. The two ponds were constructed similarly with a 12-inch thick low permeability soil layer comprised of weathered, highly oxidized, clayey soil borrowed from local mine WRDs, mixed with imported clay, compacted in two 6-inch lifts to a reported (1994) permeability of $3.6 \times 10^{-6}$ cm/sec. The clay was covered with 8-oz/yd² woven geotextile overlain by a 40-mil HDPE primary liner. Pond leak detection consisted of a series of 3-inch diameter perforated Advanced Drainage Systems (ADS) pipes wrapped in 8-oz/yd² geotextile and placed into channels constructed in the low permeability soil layer. These pipes originally connected to a solid 6-inch PVC pipe that drained into a collection sump located below the synthetic liner on the downgradient side of each pond. The perforated pipes were surrounded by minus 2-inch diameter crushed rock. Based on the poor operational history of similar LCRS designs utilizing geotextile as a fugitive solution conveyance layer, the Division no longer approves such designs and the functionality of these LCRSs cannot be accepted without field confirmation. In the case of the A-Barren Pond, the LCRS leakage detection port (EPLDS-A) was not located during a 2010 compliance inspection and the pond is now monitored and managed as a single-lined pond. The A-Pregnant Pond was removed in 2011-2012, as noted below.

The B-Pad was constructed with three ponds; a pregnant, a barren, and a storm containment pond. All three ponds were constructed with an LCRS to the same specification as the A-Pad ponds except for the use of a 60-mil HDPE primary liner instead of the 40-mil HDPE liner used for the A-Pad. Leak detection between the primary liner and the low permeability soil layer was provided by a series of 3-inch diameter perforated ADS pipes laid in 6-inch deep gravel-filled channels. The perforated pipes connected to a manifold, which directed the combined flows into a 6-inch diameter PVC pipe. The PVC pipe reported to an external collection sump for solution inventory and evacuation. As with the A-Pad pond LCRS design, the Division would no longer approve such a design and the functionality of this system cannot be accepted without field confirmation. The B-Pad storm containment pond 60-mil HDPE liner was replaced with 80-mil HDPE in 2008, and was repurposed as the B-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond associated with the 2008 Ruth Pit expansion minor modification. The B-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond is now monitored and managed as a single-lined pond.

The A-Pregnant Pond, B-Pregnant Pond, and B-Barren Pond were permanently closed (removed) in 2011-2012 in accordance with an approved FPPC, and contaminated soil underneath them, and underneath the previously closed B-Pad
carbon recovery plant building, was excavated and placed on the A-Pad and B-Pad North, respectively. Because residual contamination remained in the bottom of the excavations, an EDC was approved by the Division in April 2013 to backfill all excavations with compacted non-PAG waste rock, covered with a compacted, minimum 3-foot thick, low permeability cover layer (maximum permeability 1 x 10^{-5} \text{ cm/sec}), which is graded to shed stormwater laterally into riprapped drainage ditches. The low permeability cover layer is overlain with a minimum 1-foot thick erosion protection layer of non-PAG waste rock. As part of the FPPC, the A-Pad and B-Pad draindown flow was collected in lined sumps and piped to the new A-Pad and B-Pad Draindown Transfer Tanks, respectively.

The C-Pad was constructed with one pregnant and one barren solution pond. Both ponds were constructed with an LCRS similar to that of the B-Pad ponds. The leak detection system, located between the primary liner and the low permeability soil layer, consists of a 4-inch diameter perforated pipe placed in a gravel-filled trench constructed around the perimeter of each pond bottom. The perforated pipe connected to a standpipe for leachate collection and evacuation. As with the A- and B-Pad pond LCRS design, the Division would no longer approve such a design and the functionality of this system cannot be accepted without field confirmation. A 14-inch diameter pipe was installed between the two ponds to transfer solutions while maintaining adequate freeboard. The C-Pregnant and C-Barren ponds, and the associated C-Pad carbon recovery plant building, were permanently closed (removed) in accordance with an FPPC in 2010. Contaminated soil underneath each component was excavated and placed on the C-Pad. As part of the FPPC, the C-Pad draindown flow was collected in a lined sump and piped to the new C-Pad Transfer Tank.

Activities related to the Ruth Pit expansion minor modification, approved by the Division in April 2008, included construction of the A-, B-, and C-Pad-to-Mill Draindown Collection and Conveyance System (i.e., A-, B-, and C-Pad solution collection sumps and piping, Draindown Transfer Tanks, Emergency Overflow Ponds, conveyance pipelines between tanks and to the Mill, etc.) to facilitate continued fluid management during and following closure and overdumping of the gold heap leach facilities; downstream extension of the Mollie Gibson and Jupiter Seep collection points to facilitate continued monitoring during and following overdumping; closure, salvage, or removal, as appropriate, of existing process and non-process components within the footprint of the expanded Ruth Pit and the Ruth and Jupiter WRDs; and construction of a steel-reinforced concrete cap over the Deep Ruth Shaft in preparation for overdumping. The Division approved activities began in late 2008 and some activities (e.g., overdumping and FPPC implementation) were not yet completed as of 2016. FPPCs for some specific affected components have been submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Division (see below). FPPCs for remaining components that will be affected must be approved prior to commencement of closure activities or overdumping. Additional Permit modification may be required.
A-, B-, C- Heap Leach Pad and Facility Closure and Overdumping: Preparing the A-, B-, C- gold heap leach pads for closure and overdumping required construction of the A-, B-, C-Pad-to-Mill Draindown Collection and Conveyance System, which was approved by the Division as part of a Ruth Pit expansion minor modification in April 2008 and completed in December 2010.

To construct the system, gravel-filled drains were constructed within the existing solution collection channels of each pad. The drain construction involved clearing the existing channels of debris; inspecting and repairing the geomembrane channel liner as necessary; placing a layer of 12-oz/yd² geotextile on the channel base and sidewalls; placing a 4-inch diameter perforated CPE pipe in the base of the channel; covering the perforated CPE pipe with a minimum 6-inch thick layer of drainage gravel; folding the geotextile over the drainage gravel with a minimum 5-foot overlap; and regrading ore over the channel to serve as a protective layer during overdumping. Each perforated CPE pipe terminates in a 60-mil HDPE-lined, gravel-filled collection sump.

Draindown solution exits the collection sump via a solid 4-inch diameter, SDR-17 solid HDPE conveyance pipeline sealed within an 8-inch diameter, SDR-17 solid HDPE pipeline for secondary containment. The pipe-in-pipe conveyance pipeline is booted through the sump liner and conveys solution by gravity to a dedicated draindown transfer tank for each heap leach pad. Between the collection sump and the draindown transfer tank, each conveyance pipeline is placed within a 2-foot wide earthen trench at a depth of at least 3 feet below surface. Each trench is constructed with a 1-foot thick subbase compacted to at least 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557).

The overall trench construction varies, depending upon whether or not the particular portion of the trench will be overdumped. Where the trench will be overdumped, which is the case for the pad-to-tank pipelines, the trench is constructed with the subbase described above, a layer of 12-oz/yd² geotextile, and a 4-inch diameter perforated CPE pipe placed in the bottom of the trench adjacent to the conveyance pipeline. Then the trench is backfilled to the original ground surface with inert drainage gravel, the geotextile is folded over, and the trench is covered with a layer of nominally compacted soil mounded to a height of 1 foot above ground surface. In the case of the overdumped design, the perforated CPE pipe and trench serve as a French drain system to convey solution toward the transfer tank in the event of severe differential settlement or if the secondary containment pipeline is compromised. Approximately 20 feet upgradient of the transfer tank, each trench is filled with bentonite-amended soil to force any fugitive solution into the perforated CPE pipe, which transitions to a solid HDPE or ADS pipeline plumbed into the transfer tank.
Where the draindown pipeline trench will not be overdumped (non-overdumped design), which is the case for the tank-to-tank and tank-to-Mill pipelines, no geotextile or perforated CPE pipe are placed and the trench is backfilled with general fill material compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). Where the double-walled pipeline runs under a roadway, it is buried deeper (5 feet minimum), sleeved inside a tertiary containment pipe, and the trench subbase and backfill are compacted to 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). Leakage from the primary containment pipeline is conveyed by the secondary containment pipeline to a nearby LCRS port (see below), the downgradient transfer tank, or the South Tailings Thickener containment at the Mill.

A buried double-walled draindown transfer tank (see below for design details), located near each heap leach pad, is employed to temporarily store draindown solution prior to batch pumping of the solution into the adjacent conveyance pipeline to the next tank and ultimately to the Mill. Solution is conveyed from the C-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank to the B-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank, a distance of approximately 4,200 feet (increased to approximately 4,850 feet as a result of a pipeline relocation approved by the Division in January 2013); then from the B-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank to the A-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank, a distance of approximately 5,400 feet; and lastly, from the A-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank to the Mill, a distance of approximately 12,400 feet. The tank-to-tank and final tank-to-Mill conveyance pipelines will not be overdumped but will convey both pressurized flow and gravity flow due to local elevation differences along the pipeline alignment.

Based on detailed pipeline design analysis, the conveyance pipelines are constructed with a 2-inch diameter SDR 9 HDPE primary conveyance pipeline placed within a 4-inch diameter SDR 17 HDPE secondary containment pipeline to manage the calculated operating pressures and flow rates. Also, because these pipelines will not be overdumped, the pipeline trench is constructed to the non-overdumped design described above. The pipelines are equipped with LCRS ports at low points along the pipeline run and air vent ports at high points. Each port consists of a 48-inch diameter, pre-cast concrete, insulated manhole riser, approximately 36-54 inches deep, which represents tertiary containment. A blind-flanged, 4-inch diameter tee in the secondary containment pipeline is equipped with a pressure gauge, ball valve, and quick-release fitting to allow safe depressurization of the containment pipeline and removal of any fugitive solution for transport via vacuum truck to the South Tailings Thickener at the Mill. Pipeline pass-through holes in the lower wall of the manhole riser are sealed to the secondary pipe with grout or hydraulic cement. Protocols for monitoring, sampling, and transferring leakage to approved containment are provided in the Permit Fluid Management and Monitoring Plan.
Each draindown transfer tank is a unit comprised of a polyethylene tank, for primary containment, placed inside a precast concrete secondary containment vault, sized to exceed the regulatory minimum 110% secondary containment volume requirement. The transfer tanks are buried to ensure the inlet and outlet pipelines are at least 3 feet below ground surface to minimize the potential for freezing.

The transfer tanks are placed in an excavation with a 12-inch thick compacted native subbase, covered with a minimum 12-inch thick compacted layer of Type II structural fill, and backfilled with general fill material to a depth of at least 3 feet below original ground surface. The secondary containment vaults are equipped with a 4-inch diameter PVC riser pipe, slotted at the base and extending above ground surface, which serves as an inspection and evacuation port for the secondary containment.

The draindown transfer tank volumes are sized to accommodate the draindown flow from the adjacent heap leach pad plus the cumulative upgradient pad flows that could potentially report to it. The C-Pad, B-Pad, and A-Pad transfer tank volumes are 1,550, 3,135, and 5,025 gallons, respectively. Each transfer tank is equipped with a float valve that activates a pump to convey solution to the next transfer tank, or on to the Mill, as applicable, when the transfer tank is half full.

On 17 January 2017, the Division approved an EDC for the closure of the Ruth Dump Acid-Leached Material Area associated with the A-pad. A-pad spent ore was relocated and placed into a designated 37-acre footprint, ALM area, within the Ruth Dump. The surface of the spent ore will be compacted to 92% of the maximum dry density, determined by ASTM D1557, to provide a suitable subgrade for liner installation and placement. The liner subgrade will be overlain with a 60-mil double-sided textured, linear low density polyethylene (LLDPE) synthetic liner which will cover the entire ALM area. The finished liner system will then be covered with a minimum 3-foot layer of 2-inch-minus screened waste rock. This layer of waste rock will protect the liner from future waste rock dumping.

An EDC, approved by the Division, in August of 2017 allowed for the decommissioning of the B-Pad Transfer Tank and the temporary placement of a 500-gallon double walled polyethylene storage tank. This tank was sized to be able to contain the maximum flows observed to date, although there has been no observed flow since March of 2016. This tank will remain in place for approximately 12 to 15 months while the B-Pad evaporation cell (described below) is constructed during the 2018 construction season.

A FPPC and EDC was approved, by the Division, in September of 2017 to modify the existing single-lined B-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond into a double-lined and leak detected evaporation cell (E-Cell). The new B-Pad E-Cell will be constructed immediately south-east of the North B-Pad and construction will consist of using cut-to-fill excavations, grading, compaction, and liner subgrade preparation. The
E-Cell will utilize 3H:1V side slopes, have a depth of 6-feet, and will have crest dimensions of 170 feet by 116 feet. The E-Cell will utilize a smoother 80-mil HDPE secondary liner, a layer of geonet for leakage conveyance, and a textured 60-mil HDPE primary liner that will be overlain by a 20oz/yd² non-woven geotextile. The E-Cell will have a 2% grade that drains to the lowest point of the cell where a geotextile-wrapped drainage gravel filled sump will be used to collect any fugitive solution. The 4,300 gallon sump will have the ability to be pumped by a 6-inch diameter riser pipe. The E-Cell will be backfilled with a minimum of 3-feet of select alluvial gravel, with a 1-foot thick alluvial soil cover over exposed liner around the perimeter of the E-Cell. A layer of drain rock or gravel will be placed over the backfilled material to minimize dust generation and access by avian wildlife.

A seepage distribution system will be installed within the E-Cell backfill by excavating parallel trenches, approximately 10 feet on-center, lining them with an 8 oz/yd² geotextile and the placement of a 4-inch diameter perforated CPE pipe in the base of the lined trench. The trench will then be backfilled with drain gravel and the geotextile will be wrapped around the drainage gravel. The distribution will then be buried approximately 18-inches below the final soil surface.

The E-Cell is designed to handle the 500-year, 24-hour storm event and the maximum expected draindown flow rate of 0.25 gpm. The E-Cell will have a total storage capacity of 100,000 gallons within the soil backfill and drain down distribution system. An additional 385,000 gallons of storage capacity will be provided above the backfilled alluvial gravel, giving the B-Pad E-Cell a total capacity of 485,000 gallons.

The C-Pad collection system only and the entire C-B-A Pad leak-detected conveyance pipeline were commissioned in late March 2010. The balance of the system construction was completed in accordance with Division-approved designs, with minor field adjustments, in September 2010, and authorization to commission was provided in October 2010, following as-built and QA/QC acceptance.

The transfer tanks, pump systems, and emergency overflow ponds are to be inspected weekly, except twice weekly for the C-Pad system. In the event of an overflow, or a need to discharge to effect repairs, each tank is equipped with a 4-inch diameter HDPE emergency overflow pipe. The A-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank will overflow to the existing A-Pad Barren Pond (construction and design description above); the B-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank will overflow to the existing B-Pad Stormwater Pond (construction and design description above); and the C-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank will overflow to the new, purpose-built C-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond.

The C-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond measures approximately 50 feet on a side by 5 feet deep. The liner system consists of a single layer of 60-mil HDPE geomembrane placed on a 12-inch thick layer of underliner material compacted to
95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) constructed over 8 inches of scarified native subbase compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557).

Based on the design of both the existing and new ponds, the A- and B-Pad Emergency Overflow Ponds are monitored and managed as single-lined ponds with a 20-day evacuation limit for containment of process solution, including heap leach pad draindown solution and MIW. Due to inadequate freeboard capacity at 2011 draindown flow rates, the C-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond is monitored more frequently (twice weekly) and evacuated within five days after any fluid reports to the pond. All pond designs will accommodate a minimum of one week of maximum cumulative draindown flow (although for the C-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond the 2011 estimated one week maximum draindown flow of 52,214 gallons would leave only 6 inches of freeboard if the pond was previously empty) and the Permit requires the design capacity be available at all times. The C-Pad draindown flow rate declined to below 1.8 gpm in 2015, but the twice weekly monitoring requirement for the C-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond was retained in the 2016 Permit renewal because of the possibility that the decline was due to temporary drought conditions.

An EDC was approved by the Division in January 2013 for the relocation of a section of the C-Pad draindown conveyance pipeline between the C-Pad and B-Pad Draindown Transfer Tanks to make room for a proposed expansion of the Kimbley Pit. The EDC authorizes the removal and decontamination of 3,088 feet of the pipeline, including pipeline LCRS ports DCPLDP-1 and DCPLDP-2, and construction of a new replacement section of pipeline up to 600 feet north of the existing alignment. The new pipeline section is approximately 3,735 feet long and includes replacement LCRS ports DCPLDP-1R and DCPLDP-2R located at low points in the pipeline. The design of the new pipeline section is identical to the existing pipeline, except the pipeline pass-through holes in the concrete manhole risers are sealed using welded HDPE rather than grout or cement. Existing transfer tanks and emergency overflow ponds are unaffected by the EDC.

An EDC was approved by the Division in September 2013 for a similar relocation of two conveyance pipeline sections to make room for further expansion of the Ruth Pit. One of the replaced sections is a 3,756-foot section between the B-Pad and A-Pad transfer tanks, which is replaced with a 3,822-foot new pipeline section located 200-600 feet further north. The replaced section featured two air vent ports, one check valve, and the two LCRS ports DCPLDP-3 and DCPLDP-4. The new pipeline section features one air vent port, two check valves, and the three new LCRS ports DCPLDP-3R, DCPLDP-4AR, and DCPLDP-4BR. The second replaced pipeline section is a 1,412-foot section immediately downstream of the A-Pad transfer tank and on the east and south sides of the A-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond, which is replaced with a 940-foot new pipeline section aligned on the north side of the A-Pad Emergency Overflow Pond. This new section features one air
vent port but no LCRS ports or check valves; the section it replaced had no ports or check valves. All pipeline and port construction is the same as previous. The pipeline pass-through holes in the tertiary containment walls of the concrete manhole risers are sealed using a hydraulic cement and elastomeric sealant. The EDC required removal and triple rinsing (into approved containment) of the replaced pipeline sections.

**Weary Flats Heap Leach Pad (aka D-Pad):** The D-Pad Phase 1 was commissioned in 1991. The original facility design included two leach pad phases, but only the first phase was constructed. With the 2010 Permit renewal, the Minor Modification authorization to reconstruct certain existing components and construct additional new components as part of the D-Pad heap leach expansion, approved by the Division 30 August 2006, was rescinded. A separate revised Minor Modification to expand D-Pad was submitted in December 2012, but was withdrawn in March 2015 prior to completion of the review process.

The D-Pad facility is located north of the Mill and currently consists of the Phase 1 leach pad, one pregnant pond, one barren pond, and a process plant. The existing heap is 90 feet high and contains 695,000 cubic yards (approximately 500,000 tons) of spent leach ore. As described above for the other gold heap leach pads, addition of cyanide to the heap ended in 1994 and the heap was test rinsed until 1998, with fluid comprised of draindown solution, make-up water, and meteoric water. The practice of rinsing heap leach pads is no longer encouraged by the Division. The 2011 estimated seasonal draindown from D-Pad was approximately 5 gpm (1-2 gpm in 2015). Solution from the D-Pad barren pond could previously be pumped via a 4-inch diameter HDPE surface pipeline to Carr’s Pond (via the North Stormwater Shed vault), but that pipe is no longer connected.

The D-Pad Phase 1 footprint measures approximately 12.6 acres and was constructed to a height of approximately 100 feet above the liner in 12- to 25-foot angle-of-repose lifts that have been recontoured to approximately 2.5H:1V side slopes. The liner system of the Phase 1 leach pad consists of a 12-inch thick subbase compacted in two 6-inch lifts with a maximum permeability of 1 x 10⁻⁵ cm/sec. The subbase is covered with a single liner of 80-mil HDPE geomembrane, which is overlain by a 24-inch thick drainage layer of crushed spent ore, off-loaded from the B-Pad. Perforated HDPE hydraulic relief pipes, located above the synthetic liner and within the drainage layer, convey pregnant solution to a collection box and ultimately to the D-Pad pregnant pond. A layer of geonet, encased with geotextile, is located between the geomembrane liner and the 12-inch thick soil subbase for routing fugitive process solution from the solution collection box into a vertical HDPE standpipe where it is monitored and evacuated. Secondary containment and leak detection for the HDPE process solution pipelines that convey solution from the collection box to the D-Pad Pregnant Pond is provided by an 18-inch diameter ADS pipe, which surrounds the process pipelines.
Leak detection is provided under each of the three main leach pad solution collection headers and solution collection channels. The LCRS consists of a 3-foot wide piece of geonet encased in geotextile, placed between the geomembrane liner and the soil subbase along the entire corridor of the solution collection pipes and channels. The three leak detection pipes join in a common sump, which collects fugitive solution and routes it via a 2-inch diameter HDPE pipe into a 6-inch diameter HDPE standpipe for monitoring and evacuation. The common sump is approximately 5 feet square by 1 foot deep, filled with clean gravel and located between the synthetic liner and soil subbase.

Documentation for the design and construction of the D-Pad process ponds is very limited. Based on available descriptions, the pregnant pond measures approximately 400 feet by 225 feet in plan-view with a capacity of approximately 6 million gallons; the barren pond measures approximately 250 feet by 125 feet in plan-view, with a capacity of approximately 1.8 million gallons. For each pond, the 18-inch thick subbase was constructed of native and clayey borrow material in three 6-inch thick compacted lifts. The upper 12 inches of subbase material was amended with bentonite, compacted, and reported to have achieved a hydraulic conductivity of $4.3 \times 10^{-7}$ cm/sec. The compacted subbase was covered with a layer of 12-oz/yd² geotextile and a single layer of 80-mil HDPE. The LCRS system for the ponds is believed to be similar to that constructed for the B-Pad and C-Pad ponds. If so, the Division no longer approves such LCRS designs and their functionality cannot be accepted without field confirmation.

**C-Pad Disposal Area for Alta Gold Tailings:** Historic records indicate that Silver King Mines, and subsequently Alta Gold Corporation, deposited an estimated 1.7 million tons of gold tailings (also known as the Alta Gold Tailings or AGT) produced by the Lone Tree Mill cyanide recovery circuit into the Ruth Pit Lake during the period 1988 through 1990. The Lone Tree Mill, which has been decommissioned and dismantled, and the gold milling and tailings disposal activities were authorized by WPCP NEV0060003. The conditions and limitations of WPCP NEV0060003 were subsequently consolidated into WPCP NEV0092105 in 1999. The Division would no longer approve such a discharge.

In preparation for resumption of mining and expansion of the Ruth Pit, an EDC modification was submitted and approved by the Division in March 2010, for construction of the C-Pad Disposal Area for placement of AGT within the C-Pad footprint prior to overdumping of the C-Pad with waste rock as part of permanent closure. The approved design allowed relocation of a large portion of the AGT material from the Ruth Pit, where it will be dewatered in-situ, prior to placement in the Division-approved containment of the C-Pad Disposal Area. All AGT material was relocated to the C-Pad Disposal Area by May 2011, and related AGT monitoring requirements were removed from the Permit with the 2016 renewal.
A 30 September 2008 Interim Findings Report (2008 Report), appended to the EDC design report as a reference, estimates that between 1 million and 1.5 million tons of AGT were deposited into the Ruth Pit. The 2008 Report also estimates the AGT may overlie up to 100 feet or approximately 4 million tons of waste rock placed in the pit between the end of copper mining in 1978, and the commencement of gold milling operations and discharge of tailings into the Ruth Pit.

The 2008 Report contains characterization data of drill-hole samples of both AGT solids (14 samples) and entrained water (11 samples). The AGT solids data include MWMP-Profile II, whole rock, and acid-base-accounting (ABA) analytical results. The entrained water was analyzed for the Profile II suite of dissolved constituents.

Based on the characterization, the AGT solids do not exhibit potential to generate acid. Reported constituent concentrations exceeded the groundwater quality reference values for the Ruth Mineralized Hydrogeologic Block (the Block that the Ruth Pit is in) for TDS, sulfate (SO$_4$), manganese (Mn), and thallium (Tl) for the mean [emphasis added] of all samples. Review of the data identified single exceedances for cadmium (Cd 0.0131 mg/L) and nickel (Ni 0.112 mg/L) in two separate samples, and only one value above the 0.01 mg/L lower limit of detection used at the time for WAD cyanide (0.077 mg/L), but the overall mean concentrations for all samples did not exceed Ruth Mineralized Block reference values for these constituents. The mean TDS, SO$_4$, Mn, and Tl values also exceeded the groundwater reference values established for the adjacent Saxton North Hydrogeologic Block (the Block that the C-Pad is in), and the Mn and Tl mean values also exceed the reference values for the adjacent Saxton Mineralized Hydrogeologic Block (the Block that the C-Pad Draindown Transfer Tank is in).

Reported mean constituent concentrations for water entrained in the AGT exceeded Profile I reference values for TDS, Ni, SO$_4$, Cd, iron (Fe), Mn, Tl, and, as calculated during review of the data, zinc (Zn). These entrained water mean constituent values also exceed the background groundwater reference values established for both the adjacent Saxton North and Saxton Mineralized Hydrogeologic Blocks.

The Division-approved March 2010 Phase 1 and Phase 2 C-Pad Disposal Area EDC design (18.8 million cubic feet) will accommodate relocation of approximately 850,000 tons of dried AGT solids based on a dry density of 90 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). The in-situ density of the tailings solids in characterization drill holes ranged from 90 pcf near surface to 115 pcf at depth. If in-situ density of the dewatered tailings solids can be increased during placement on the C-Pad containment, the potential storage can be increased to approximately 950,000 tons at 100 pcf and about 1 million tons at 110 pcf. An EDC for construction of a Phase 3 expansion to the C-Pad Disposal Area was approved by the Division in December 2010. The Phase 3 lift increased the total capacity to a maximum 1.53 to 1.87 million tons, depending upon the dry density of the material. The Phase 3 design also required construction of the Wedge Pit Buttress to stabilize the lift. An EDC
for construction of Phases 4 and 5 of the C-Pad Disposal Area was approved by the Division in February 2014. Phases 4 and 5 involved filling remaining space in the C-Pad Disposal Area with spent ore from the South B-Pad and A-Pad, respectively, as described below, rather than with AGT.

The C-Pad Disposal Area was constructed to create a bermed retaining basin structure on the top of the C-Pad, inboard of the pad containment synthetic liner and solution collection system limits. The basin was constructed with approximately 1.5H:1V angle-of-repose side slopes in accordance with the design, which required posted dump slope toe/C-Pad intersection line setting-out and dimensional field surveys to preclude deposition of AGT outside the disposal area base and crest boundaries and the underlying liner limits. The initial, Phase 1, disposal area retaining berm crest elevation was constructed to 7,174 feet AMSL; Phase 2 was constructed to a berm crest elevation of 7,202 feet AMSL; and Phase 3 was constructed to a final maximum berm crest elevation of 7,227 feet AMSL. No AGT material is to be placed outside the C-Pad Disposal Area basin, and a minimum 2-foot freeboard was required between the maximum tailings elevation and the maximum basin perimeter crest elevation.

Prior to any tailings placement, the Division required that synthetic liner, crushed tanks, and any other materials previously placed within the footprint of the retaining basin during approved C-Pad pond and component final closure activities must be thoroughly punctured to ensure downward migration of meteoric and entrained solution to the C-Pad collection and conveyance system. Additionally, approximately 1,695 cubic yards (approximately 2,000 tons) of pond sediment removed during closure of the C-Pad pregnant and barren solution ponds must be placed in maximum 8-inch thick lifts and thoroughly mixed into the spent leach material by ripping with a bulldozer prior to placement of AGT.

Stability analysis indicates the design exceeds all minimum static and pseudostatic factor-of-safety (FOS). However, to improve stability for the Phase 3 lift, the Wedge Pit Buttress was constructed by backfilling the adjacent southern portion of the Wedge Pit with characterized non-PAG waste rock. The buttress design specifies side slopes no steeper than 1.5H:1V and a minimum 80-foot crest width that will ultimately be expanded to 135 feet wide.

Tailings material was removed by a contractor from the Ruth Pit for direct transport and placement in the C-Pad Disposal Area using mine haul trucks. Compaction of the tailings material, which may have increased the ultimate capacity of the design, was accomplished, as practicable, by the haul truck traffic during placement. Phase 1 construction was completed in May 2010 and Phase 2 construction was completed in July 2010. Phase 3 construction was completed during spring 2011, and the final AGT placement in the C-Pad Disposal Area was completed during summer 2011, leaving approximately 17 to 32 feet of freeboard above the top of the AGT and below the Phase 3 crest.
Based on the characterization data and recognizing the minimum design criteria for tailings impoundments established in NAC 445A.437, the EDC concludes that placement of the tailings within the C-Pad Disposal Area eliminates the potential for the AGT to degrade waters of the State because the disposal area is located within the catchment area of the lined footprint of the C-Pad, which is hydraulically linked to the approved A-, B-, C-Pad-to-Mill Draindown Collection and Conveyance System, which conveys collected solution to the Robinson Mill for use as process make-up water. Further expansion of the C-Pad Disposal Area will require additional Permit modifications.

The February 2014 Division EDC approval, and the associated January 2014 Division approval of an FPPC for South B-Pad, authorize the complete removal of the South B-Pad and stacking of the spent ore from South B-Pad in the C-Pad Disposal Area (Phase 4). The removal of South B-Pad was necessitated by encroaching earth cracks and the potential for additional failure of the adjacent north wall of the Ruth Pit. The Permittee also intends to expand the Ruth Pit to the north into the South B-Pad footprint, and possibly to the west into the A-Pad footprint as well. The EDC also conditionally approves the stacking of spent ore from A-Pad in the C-Pad Disposal Area (Phase 5), subject to the prior submittal and approval of an FPPC for A-Pad and the underlying Mollie Gibson Acid-Leached Dump.

Phases 4 and 5 of the C-Pad Disposal Area leave the height of the perimeter retaining berm crest at the previously approved Phase 3 elevation (7,227 feet AMSL). For Phase 4, the spent ore will be stacked within the disposal area to approximately 200 feet above the liner, which equates to about 53 feet above the retaining berm crest with an approximate maximum elevation of 7,280 feet AMSL. For Phase 5, the Permit specifies that spent ore and waste rock may not be stacked more than 295 feet above the liner (approximately 7,375 feet AMSL). In both phases, the spent ore will be placed to achieve a maximum slope angle of 2.5H:1V from its highest point down to the retaining berm. During placement of spent ore, a temporary perimeter stormwater catchment ditch at least 10-feet wide and 5-feet deep, which is sized to contain runoff from the 100-year, 24-hour storm event, will be maintained at the outer toe of the spent ore against the inner embankment of the retaining berm. The retaining berm crest will be graded to drain inward. The tentative plan for permanent closure of the C-Pad Disposal Area includes regrading the outer slope of the spent ore (maximum slope 2.5H:1V) to eliminate the perimeter stormwater catchment ditch, followed by overdumping the spent ore with at least 5 feet of waste rock.

A revised stability analysis included with the EDC for Phases 4 and 5 of the C-Pad Disposal Area indicates that Phases 4 and 5 will be stable as designed. A deformation analysis was also performed, indicating that the displacement within
the C-Pad Disposal Area from a magnitude 7.5 earthquake would be less than 1 centimeter.

The Permit requires that the A-Pad, North B-Pad, and C-Pad shall each be permanently closed pursuant to a Division-approved FPPC and schedule, concurrently with continued mining in adjacent pits according to the current mine plan.

Investigation and Mitigation of Mine-Impacted Waters (MIWs) and MIW Sources: MIWs identified in the 1997 Consent Agreement for investigation include, “Intera Pond, Ruth Pit Lake, Green Springs Ponds, The ephemeral Jupiter Pond, Star Pointer Pit Lake, Kimbley Pit Lake, Liberty Pit Lake, The ephemeral Mollie Gibson Seep, The ephemeral Juniper Seep, and Veteran/Tripp Pit Lake.”

During the period 1997 to 2004, initial characterization and evaluation of certain historic MIWs and MIW sources was completed and interim stabilization measures were performed for the purpose of remediation of MIWs and MIW sources including part of the Mollie Gibson ALD, Mollie Gibson Seep, and Mollie Gibson Pond 4; the Jupiter ALD, Jupiter Seep, and Jupiter Pond; and the Kimbley Pit Lake, Green Springs Ponds, and Intera Pond. During the 1999 to 2004 period of Temporary Closure, further site characterization was performed at other historic and recently operating facilities to support final closure planning. Despite this work, no FPPCs were fully approved by the Division until late 2010.

Documentation and specific details related to the characterization, mitigation, and closure implemented at the Robinson Operation to date are on file. Summaries of the work completed on MIWs and MIW sources follow.

Intera MIW: The Intera Pond was located in the topographic low, ephemeral stream valley, downstream of the Puritan and Sunshine ALDs, which were pre-1931 vintage. The trace of the natural drainage in which the dumps were constructed, which is a tributary of Gleason Creek, runs from the current Robinson Mill, beneath the Puritan ALD, which is now covered by the Liberty WRD, through the Intera Pond, northeast to the Juniper Seep, north between the Keystone ALD and the town of Ruth, and then east to its confluence with Gleason Creek just downstream (south) of the junction of U.S. highway 50 and State Route 485 (Keystone Junction).

The original Intera Pond, with a footprint of approximately three acres, was constructed by placing a fill embankment across the drainage and covering the footprint between the embankment and toe of the Puritan and Sunshine ALDs with a layer of “compacted clay” material. No details or specifications of the original pond construction are available. Both the pond and the ALDs are considered MIW sources.
‘Oxide’ copper was leached from the Puritan and Sunshine ALDs with sulfuric acid and the Intera Pond was used from the 1950’s into the 1970’s to collect the copper leachate emanating from the toe of the upstream ALDs. The copper leachate was treated in a nearby recovery plant by either precipitation, probably onto steel scrap material to make ‘sponge copper’, or with solvent extraction/electro-winning techniques to recover copper metal of relatively high purity. MIW, in the form of acid leachate, continued to emanate from the toe of the ALDs and reported to the pond in the late 1990’s, driven by meteoric water infiltrating the ALDs with a catchment area of approximately 280 acres.

The Intera Drain was constructed in the fall of 1997 after Division approval, and although a “draft” design report dated 25 June 1997, is on file and is the basis for this description, no as-builts have been located. Based on the 1997 design, the Intera Drain was constructed by dewatering the Intera Pond, excavating a 300-foot-long by approximately 22-foot-deep trapezoidal cut in the natural drainage within the southern half of the pond footprint along a northwest-southeast axis; lining the base and sidewalls of the cut with 12-oz/yd² geotextile; placing a 12-inch diameter, SDR 26, HDPE slotted collection pipeline along the base of the lined cut and covering the collection pipeline with select, coarse, “rhyolite” waste rock to form a drainage layer enveloped with 12-oz/yd² geotextile; and covering the geotextile with a 5-foot layer of select waste rock to complete the collection drain. The design capacity of the drain was to be approximately 500,000 gallons assuming a void ratio of 0.35 within the selected coarse waste rock drainage media.

An inclined well was originally constructed to evacuate the Intera Drain by placing a 24-inch diameter HDPE pipeline along the existing north-facing dump slope at the south end of the drain. The bottom portion of the inclined well casing was slotted, encased in geotextile to prevent migration of fines, and bedded into a “pump drain sump” located at the southeast, downgradient end of the Intera Drain, within the drainage layer material. The pump drain sump was equipped with a dedicated submersible pump attached to a 4-inch diameter SDR 9.3 HDPE discharge pipeline, located within the well casing that discharged to the gravity-flow pipeline to the Liberty Pit sump pump for conveyance by existing pipeline to the Robinson Mill. Submersible pressure transducers, for determining static solution elevation in the drain, and associated instrumentation cables were located in two 3.5-inch diameter HDPE pipelines placed on either side of the well casing to connect the drain instrumentation to a surface control box.

Subsequent closure activities for the Intera Pond included placement, in maximum 15-foot lifts, of 30 to 50 feet of select rhyolite waste rock over the pond and drain areas. This work was followed by overdumping of the pond and drain areas, and the Puritan, Sunshine, and adjacent Juniper ALDs, with waste rock, which was to be compacted and graded to prevent ponding or storage of meteoric water and to reduce the potential for infiltration of meteoric water through the ALDs and consequently reduce the seepage flow rate into the Intera Drain.
Once waste rock was deposited to an elevation approximately 70 feet above the inclined wellhead and the surface control box, the inclined well casing failed and the well was replaced in July 2000, with a 267.3-foot deep vertical well. Based on the January 2001 as-built report, the drill hole for the replacement well penetrated 246 feet of waste rock material to the top of the Intera Drain, identified by the presence of geotextile material used to encapsulate the drain, which was observed in the drill water return flow. Deeper in the July 2000 drill hole for the replacement well, the coarse, unaltered rhyolite used for drain backfill was intercepted from 246 feet to the bottom of the drain at approximately 256 feet, where geotextile material was again encountered and observed in the drill water return flow. Below the drain, the July 2000 drill hole for the replacement well intercepted limestone to the completion depth of 267.3 feet. Water was encountered at a depth of 240 feet in the drill hole.

The 6-inch diameter well, constructed to a depth of 267 feet, was constructed with mild steel solid casing from 0 to 232 feet, stainless steel solid casing from 232 to 242 feet, a stainless steel screen from 242 to 257 feet, and stainless steel solid casing from 257 to 267 feet with a stainless steel bottom plug. The casing annular space was completely backfilled from the bottom of the hole with sand or gravel, except for the placement of bentonite chips between 192 and 198 feet in the well and cement grout from ground surface to a depth of 10 feet in the well. A 2-inch diameter, 257-foot deep vertical well (PZ-1) was drilled nearby in 2006, to house new drain solution elevation transducers and communication cables. Based on stage curves developed during the original design, the fluid elevation in the Intera Drain shall not exceed 6,917 feet AMSL, which the design documents indicate is the approximate top elevation of the geotextile enveloped drainage layer. However, the design documents also indicate that the crest of the original clay-covered embankment is 6,930 feet AMSL.

An EDC modification was approved by the Division in August 2008 to replace the existing 2-inch diameter, single-wall surface pipeline with a new pipeline to convey Intera Drain MIW solution over a distance of approximately 6,650 feet from the vertical Intera Well to the Robinson Mill for use as process make-up water. The new conveyance pipeline is designed to eliminate freezing problems that occurred frequently with the original surface pipeline.

The Intera Drain Conveyance Pipeline system is constructed of a 2-inch diameter SDR-9 HDPE primary containment pipeline within a 4-inch diameter SDR-17 HDPE secondary containment pipeline. The pipeline is buried in a trench at a depth of 36 to 54 inches below ground surface, to prevent freezing, along an alignment parallel to the A-, B-, C-Pad-to-Mill Draindown Collection and Conveyance System solution conveyance pipeline. The Intera pipeline high-point, located just west of the crusher between the Intera Drain wellhead and the South Thickener located at the Mill, is equipped with an air-release valve. The design allows both
the conveyance pipeline and the secondary containment to drain by gravity away from the air-release valve to either the wellhead or the thickener.

The wellhead end of the pipeline secondary containment is equipped with a leakage detection and collection port (ICPLDP-1), located in a subgrade pre-cast concrete vault, which can be monitored and evacuated if necessary. The Mill-end of the pipeline secondary containment will discharge directly into the Mill process circuit at the South Thickener, where leakage can be monitored and quantified as necessary (ICPLDP-2).

In addition to leak detection and collection at the wellhead and Mill-end of the conveyance pipeline, a leak detection port (ICPLDP-3) was added at a topographic low point in the Intera pipeline alignment on the top of the Liberty WRD. The port consists of a 48-inch diameter, insulated pre-cast concrete manhole riser, approximately 54 inches deep. A blind-flanged, 4-inch diameter tee in the secondary containment pipeline is equipped with a pressure gauge, ball valve, and quick-release fitting to allow safe depressurization of the containment pipeline and removal of any fugitive solution for approved disposal.

Documentation of the inflows reporting to the Intera Drain indicates a 75% reduction of the inflow rate from 20 gpm in late 1997 to approximately 5 gpm in late 2001. This period spanned the initiation of site Temporary Closure in June 1999. However, the Intera Drain inflow rate rose again to approximately 20 gpm between mid-2005 (not long after the September 2004 restart of milling operations) and late 2009, and continued to flow at approximately 20 gpm for several years thereafter. An electrical geophysical survey was performed by Willowstick Technologies, LLC, in October 2009, to investigate for the source of increased Intera flow. The 28 January 2010 final report of the survey identified a possible flow pathway from the vicinity of the Mill Water Ponds to Intera Drain. Various actions were taken, as described below, to eliminate this and other potential contributors of water to the Intera MIW.

A schedule of compliance item was added to the Permit with the 2005 renewal, which required submittal by 30 March 2010, of documentation that the portions of the Liberty and South Tripp/Veteran WRDs contributing MIW to Intera Drain and Green Springs MIWs, respectively, have been compacted and contoured to prevent infiltration of meteoric water and oxygen and promote the controlled runoff of meteoric water reporting to the surface of the WRDs. The Permittee failed to provide the required documentation, which led to issuance of an FOAV and Order by the Division on 26 April 2010. The Permittee appealed the FOAV and Order to the State Environmental Commission (SEC) on 21 May 2010. The Intera Corrective Action Plan (Intera CAP), dated 26 October 2010, was accepted by the Division on 03 November 2010, to resolve the FOAV and Order. On 08 November 2010, the Permittee filed a request with the SEC to withdraw the appeal, which was
granted on 22 November 2010. With termination of the appeal, the FOAV and Order is no longer appealable.

The 26 October 2010 Intera CAP required several actions be taken to identify all potential sources of water reporting to the Intera Drain. In accordance with the CAP, the Permittee removed the two water truck fill station standpipe located adjacent to the Mill Water Ponds (completed 30 September 2010) and completed an integrity evaluation of pipelines in the area (completed 29 November 2011) prior to relining the Mill Water Ponds by 15 August 2011 (completed 26 February 2012), in accordance with a Division-approved EDC. A required follow-up electrical geophysical survey after replacement of the Mill Water Ponds was completed 14 January 2012 by Willowstick Technologies, LLC. The 2012 geophysical survey found a significant reduction in conductivity compared to the 2009 survey, suggesting that replacement of the Mill Water Ponds and removal of the water standpipes were successful in reducing infiltration into the Liberty WRD. However, as of 2016, the Intera Drain inflow rate remained near 20 gpm. The Intera CAP also required submittal, by 01 April 2011, of an FPPC with proposed implementation schedule for the Intera MIW and its source area on the Liberty WRD. The CAP called for the construction of an approved passive draindown collection system and pond at the Juniper ALD toe by 30 October 2011, initiation of system testing by 30 November 2011, and completion by 01 October 2012 of an approved engineered cover for the portion of the Liberty WRD that lies within the Intera Drain source area. Due to partial non-compliance with the 26 October 2010 CAP, the Division and RNMC negotiated and signed a Modified Intera CAP, dated 06 October 2011, with revised deadlines.

In response to the Modified Intera CAP, a combined Intera/Juniper FPPC and EDC was submitted in September 2014, and revised and resubmitted in April 2015 in response to Division comments. The EDC is described below in the Juniper MIW section. The FPPC was revised further in response to Division comments, and is under review by the Division as of May 2016.

In addition to other actions described above to reduce the inflow rate to the Intera Drain, the August 2014 Division approval to replace the single-lined Carr’s Pond with a new double-lined pond (described in a separate section above) also has the potential to eliminate a contributing source of water to the Intera MIW. Construction and commissioning of the new Carr’s Pond occurred in 2015.

**Juniper Seep MIW:** The original Juniper Seep was located immediately downdgradient of the toe of the historic Juniper ALD. The seep dried up after the 1997 construction of the Intera Drain, which facilitated collection of the Intera MIW and commencement of overdumping of the historic Puritan, Sunshine, and Juniper ALDs to create the Liberty WRD. The Juniper Seep MIW resumed flowing intermittently in 2006 at a new location at the toe of the Liberty WRD downdgradient from the original seep. Juniper Seep MIW flows increased in 2008, apparently in
response to wet weather, a partial slump failure of the toe of the Liberty WRD, and subsequent regrading and stormwater-related construction work by the Permittee to reduce ponding and infiltration of stormwater on the Liberty WRD by focusing runoff into riprap swales down the dump face. Juniper Seep MIW flow rate monitoring commenced in 2012; during the first two years of monitoring, surface flows from the seep ranged from approximately 0.1 gpm to 1.1 gpm. Juniper Seep MIW has poor water quality with a pH of approximately 2 standard units (SU), TDS to 41,000 mg/L, acidity to 27,000 mg/L, and high metals concentrations.

An EDC was approved by the Division in April 2015 to install nine monitoring wells at the Project, three of which (JUN-1, JUN-2, and JUN-3) were associated with the then not yet constructed Juniper MIW collection system. The existing monitoring wells W-9A and W-9B, located downgradient of the Juniper Seep, were plugged and abandoned to make room for the new Juniper MIW Evaporation Pond. The three new wells are located further north and downgradient of W-9A and W-9B, adjacent to the Juniper drainage, and just north of the new pond.

Another EDC was approved by the Division in June 2015 for construction of the Juniper MIW Collection System and the associated Juniper Evaporation Pond. The EDC was submitted along with an FPPC for the Intera and Juniper MIWs and their source areas, as required by the Modified Intera CAP. The collection system consists of two cut-off trenches and associated piping to collect and convey the Juniper MIW to the new evaporation pond. The Juniper MIW Collection System and Juniper Evaporation Pond were constructed in 2015 and commissioned in 2015-2016.

The collection system will be overdumped as part of the planned northeastward expansion of the Liberty/TS WRD. The ultimate northeast toe of the Liberty/TS WRD will be located immediately south of the new double-lined Juniper Evaporation Pond. A minimum 6-foot tall rockfall protection berm is constructed between the ultimate dump toe and the pond to protect the pond and associated infrastructure from material raveling off of the dump.

The upper cut-off trench is located approximately 120 feet north of the previous 2006-2015 Liberty/TS WRD toe, and measures approximately 15 feet deep by 170 feet long, spanning the entire width of the native Juniper drainage. The lower cut-off trench is located approximately 180 feet north of the upper cut-off trench. The lower cut-off trench is approximately 10 feet deep and 50 feet long, and serves as a backup to collect any MIW flow that gets past the upper cut-off trench. Both cut-off trenches feature a steeper 0.5H:1V up-gradient (south) sidewall and a lower-angle 2H:1V down-gradient sidewall, a minimum 3-foot wide (south to north) flat bottom, and a 60-mil HDPE liner placed on the entire downgradient (north) sidewall and bottom only. The subgrade under the HDPE liner is wheel compacted. The cut-off trenches are filled with inert drain rock, which is enclosed on all sides with 8-oz/yd² geotextile. Within the trenches, the geotextile overlies the HDPE
liner on the bottom and north sidewall. The geotextile/drain-rock envelope extends upward 2 feet above the surrounding ground surface to capture any future flows along the pre-overdumping ground surface. An overlying 2-foot thick layer of sand or non-PAG waste rock protects the geotextile/drain-rock envelope from damage during future waste-rock overdumping.

A 3-inch diameter perforated HDPE collection pipe lies on the geotextile on the bottom of each cut-off trench, running east-west. A 3-inch diameter non-perforated primary HDPE conveyance pipeline penetrates the cut-off trench liner at the base of the north sidewall and tees into the perforated collection pipe at the east-west midpoint of each trench. At the upper cut-off trench, a 6-inch diameter non-perforated HDPE secondary conveyance pipeline (which contains the 3-inch diameter non-perforated primary HDPE conveyance pipeline) also penetrates, and is booted to, the cut-off trench liner. Contrastingly, at the lower cut-off trench, the 6-inch diameter non-perforated HDPE secondary conveyance pipeline terminates immediately under the cut-off trench liner, and the 3-inch diameter non-perforated HDPE primary conveyance pipeline is booted to the cut-off trench liner. In both cases, the upgradient end of the 6-inch diameter HDPE secondary conveyance pipeline is sealed such that any flow within the secondary pipe will represent leakage from the primary conveyance pipeline.

The upper cut-off trench conveyance pipeline connects with the lower cut-off trench conveyance pipeline at a wye located about 70 feet north of the lower cut-off trench. The pipeline conveys Juniper MIW northward from the cut-off trenches to the Juniper Evaporation Pond at a minimum 0.5% grade to facilitate passive drainage. The total distance from the upper cut-off trench to the evaporation pond is approximately 1,100 feet. The conveyance pipeline provides greater capacity (39 gpm) than required for anticipated MIW flow rates. As noted above, the 3-inch diameter, SDR 17, HDPE conveyance pipes are contained within 6-inch diameter, SDR 17, HDPE secondary pipes. The dual-walled conveyance pipe system is buried a minimum of 4 feet below the pre-overdumping ground surface within a pipeline trench. Two 2-inch diameter PVC conduits carrying transducer wires from piezometer PZ-4 are buried alongside the conveyance pipeline for most of the conveyance pipeline run. Within the trench, the upper 12 inches of subgrade under the conveyance pipeline is moisture conditioned and compacted to at least 90% maximum dry density, Modified Proctor (ASTM Method D1557). Over the pipeline, general fill is placed in 12-inch loose lifts and compacted to the same specification. The Permit includes monitoring requirements for the MIW at the conveyance pipeline outfall to the pond (JCP-F), and for any leakage from the primary conveyance pipe observed in the secondary pipe (JCP-LDP).

As part of the June 2015 EDC, piezometer PZ-4 was outfitted with two transducers. The collar of PZ-4 was enclosed within an 18-inch diameter ADS pipe, capped with a 2-foot by 2-foot by ½-inch thick steel plate, and buried under a 7-foot layer of compacted bedding sand to protect it from future waste rock overdumping.
two transducer cables are each contained in a separate 2-inch diameter buried PVC conduit that intersects and then follows the Juniper MIW conveyance pipeline trench. A solar-powered data logger box for the PZ-4 transducers is installed at the Juniper Evaporation Pond crest near the outfall of the MIW conveyance pipeline.

Construction of the Juniper Evaporation Pond was required by the Modified Intera CAP, and approved by the Division as part of the June 2015 EDC, to provide containment for the Juniper MIW. The trapezoidal pond has an average length (east-west) of approximately 350 feet, an average width (north-south) of 275 feet north-south, and a maximum depth of 12 feet. Pond capacities are approximately 4.7 million gallons at the 2-foot minimum freeboard level, and approximately 6.1 million gallons at the crest. From bottom up, the pond liner system consists of the upper 12 inches of subgrade (or structural fill) moisture conditioned and compacted to 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557), a 60-mil smooth HDPE secondary liner, an HDPE geonet layer for leak detection, and an 80-mil HDPE single-sided textured primary liner with textured side up. Eight-inch diameter ballast tubes constructed of HDPE liner filled with sand are placed on the pond bottom to stabilize it in windy conditions when the pond is empty or nearly so. The pond bottom is graded toward the southeast corner where the LCRS sump is constructed between the primary and secondary liners. A geosynthetic clay layer (GCL) is installed beneath the secondary HDPE liner, only under the LCRS sump, to decrease further the subbase permeability in that area. The LCRS sump is constructed with drain rock fully enclosed within 8-oz/yd² geotextile. Evacuation of the LCRS sump is accomplished by using a pump mounted within a 6-inch diameter HDPE riser pipe that has a perforated lower end installed within the LCRS sump. The LCRS riser pipe extends up the pond sidewall between the liners and daylights at the pond crest (monitoring point JNP-LDS).

Water balance calculations indicate that in years with average precipitation and evaporation, the Juniper Evaporation Pond can contain a sustained MIW inflow of up to 2.2 gpm, and the precipitation from the 100-year, 24-hour storm event falling within the pond perimeter, while maintaining the 2-foot minimum freeboard required in the Permit. Further calculations indicate that if the pond were subjected to the wettest 7-year period on record at the Ruth weather station (years 2003-2009), while receiving a sustained MIW inflow of 2.2 gpm, and including an additional 100-year, 24-hour storm event (which would far exceed the Division’s minimum design criteria), the pond would still maintain a 1-foot freeboard.

Final permanent closure of the Juniper Evaporation Pond will include conversion to a backfilled evaporation cell once the MIW flow rate declines sufficiently for the evaporation cell to accommodate the flow. Water balance calculations suggest that the MIW inflow rate may need to be less than 1.1 gpm before conversion to an evaporation cell to maintain a 2-foot minimum freeboard in the evaporation cell.
Aside from the MIW collected in the upper and lower cut-off trenches, the Juniper Evaporation Pond is not designed to collect any other seepage or stormwater related to the Liberty/TS WRD. The EDC includes construction of a compacted stormwater vee channel along the toe of the native side slope on either side of the Juniper drainage upstream (south) of the pond. These two vee-channels are designed to convey stormwater from the 100-year, 24-hour storm event, and possibly infiltrated meteoric water once the channels are overdumped by the Liberty/TS WRD, to a central notch in the rockfall protection berm at the ultimate toe of the Liberty/TS WRD. From that point, the comiled water from the two vee-channels is directed via a riprap apron, with a median boulder diameter ($D_{50}$) of 8 inches, into a 25-foot wide compacted trapezoidal stormwater channel that wraps around the south, west, and north sides of the Juniper Evaporation Pond and discharges into an existing stormwater channel adjacent to the Keystone ALD. The trapezoidal Juniper Evaporation Pond Stormwater Channel is constructed with a 6-inch thick layer of riprap having a $D_{50}$ of 3 inches. The Permit requires water quality monitoring of the water in the Juniper Evaporation Pond Stormwater Channel at the northeast corner of the pond (monitoring point JSW), and requires that water discharged from the channel shall meet applicable water quality standards, including a pH of 6.0 – 9.0 SU.

**Green Springs Seep MIW:** The Green Springs Transfer Pond was constructed in mid-1998, to collect MIW emanating from the historic earthen Green Springs ponds and the toe of the historic Green Springs ALD, components that have been overdumped in the process of constructing the South Tripp WRD. A French drain, constructed downgradient of the historic components, collects MIW seepage and conveys it to the Green Springs Transfer Pond through a buried HDPE pipeline.

The pond was designed as a transfer pond, rather than a permanent storage pond, and was constructed with a single layer of 60-mil HDPE liner placed over a compacted soil base. The original design included an inflow structure and outfall pipeline. The latter conveyed solution to an injection pump located at the tailings impoundment BOC to introduce the MIW into the reclaim water pipeline at approximately 10 gpm. Since the 1999 Temporary Closure, flow reporting to the pond averaged less than ½ gpm, which is considerably less than the design flow. The outfall system was disconnected during the Temporary Closure period because evaporative loss maintained the pond solution below the minimum 2-foot freeboard. On 21 September 2012, the MIW flow was diverted from the Green Springs Transfer Pond to the recently constructed Division-approved Green Springs Evaporation Cell. The Transfer Pond was permanently closed in 2015 in accordance with a Division-approved FPPC, and the final closure report was approved by the Division on 20 November 2015.

The 26 October 2010 Intera CAP requires several actions be taken to address the Green Springs MIW. Among them are requirements to submit a specific FPPC by 01 May 2011 (completed 17 August 2011), that will result in permanent closure of
the MIW source area portion of the South Tripp WRD and conversion of the existing pond to a double-lined, leak detected evaporation cell or similar with post-closure monitoring. Implementation of the FPPC must be completed by 31 December 2011 (completed 30 December 2011).

In response to the Intera CAP, a new Green Springs Evaporation Cell was approved by the Division and constructed by 30 December 2011. The Division approved the commissioning of the Evaporation Cell on 18 September 2012. The completed Evaporation Cell is located immediately west of the existing Green Springs Transfer Pond. The square Evaporation Cell is 5 feet deep with the cell bottom measuring 50 feet by 50 feet. The Evaporation Cell is constructed as follows from bottom up: the upper 12 inches of native subgrade compacted to a minimum 90% of maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557); a 60-mil smooth HDPE secondary liner; a geonet leak detection layer; a 80-mil single-textured HDPE primary liner (textured side up); a 20-oz/yd² non-woven geotextile layer; and 3 feet of general fill compacted to 85-90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). The cell sidewalls and crest are covered with approximately 1 foot of compacted general fill. A solution distribution pipe network is installed approximately 6 inches above the primary liner within the general fill in the cell bottom. Distribution pipes are a series of parallel 4-inch diameter perforated CPE pipe placed 8 feet on center, connected to a 4-inch diameter perforated CPE distribution header pipe. The distribution pipes are laid in the bottom of geotextile-encased (8-oz/yd² non-woven) drain-rock-filled trenches approximately 12 inches deep and 18 inches wide within the general fill in the cell. The Evaporation Cell includes a drain-rock filled LCRS between the primary and secondary liners, which is accessed by a 6-inch diameter HDPE riser pipe that runs up the southwest sidewall of the cell between the liners and is booted through the primary liner at the cell crest to daylight as the capped LCRS monitoring port GSECLDP.

The Green Springs Evaporation Cell is fed by a buried 3-inch diameter SDR 17 HDPE primary pipe within a 6-inch diameter SDR 17 HDPE secondary pipe. The primary pipe connects to the buried 4-inch diameter single-walled HDPE Green Springs MIW transfer pipe within a subgrade epoxy-coated steel containment junction box located a short distance northeast of the Green Springs Transfer Pond. The junction box contains valves to facilitate flow control to either the Transfer Pond or the Evaporation Cell. A sampling port for the influent MIW is located on the double-lined northeast crest of the Evaporation Cell. It consists of a capped, vertically-mounted, 18-inch diameter SDR 17 HDPE pipe with factory-welded base that receives MIW from the pipe-in-pipe MIW feed line and conveys it to the Evaporation Cell distribution header pipe. In the Evaporation Cell, an overflow pipe (4-inch diameter non-perforated CPE pipe) connected to the distribution header daylight on the surface of the general fill in the cell bottom. The overflow pipe will flow if the distribution pipe network and drain-rock trenches become saturated. The Evaporation Cell also features a vertical 6-inch diameter HDPE monitoring port located within the southeast quadrant of the cell that is used to
measure solution depth and freeboard in the cell and to obtain solution samples for analysis. The perforated and sand-encased lower section of the monitoring port is seated on the cell bottom within 18 inches of drain rock.

**Jupiter Seep MIW:** The Jupiter Seep MIW occurs in a natural ephemeral drainage located on the northeast toe of the Jupiter ALD. The original collection system was constructed in mid-2001. A minor modification was approved by the Division in April 2008, in preparation for resumption of mining and expansion of the Ruth Pit and construction of the expanded Ruth and Jupiter WRDs. To facilitate continued monitoring and quantification of flow from the Jupiter ALD Seep, the existing seepage collection area was modified and the sampling point was relocated to accommodate expansion of the waste rock facility. The seep area was excavated to improve alignment of the existing seepage route and a drainage trench was constructed to a new discharge point downstream. The new excavated seep was lined with 12-oz/yd² geotextile and backfilled with gravel to direct collected flow to an excavated trench approximately 3 feet wide and 2 feet deep.

The 2008 seepage collection design, for the portions of the collection drain that will be overdumped, consists of a 12-inch thick base compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557), placement of a 4-inch diameter perforated CPE collection pipeline along the bottom of the trench, backfilling with inert drain rock to 12 inches above the collection pipeline, folding the geotextile over the drain rock, and backfilling the remainder of the trench with general fill that is nominally compacted. Where the trench will not be overdumped, no geotextile was placed, the 4-inch diameter perforated CPE pipe transitions to a solid 4-inch diameter CPE pipe, and only general fill, compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557), was used to backfill the trench above the pipeline. The trench gradient will be maintained at a minimum 1% grade.

The original approved design includes a solid conveyance pipeline that daylights at a designated point, downstream along the existing seepage flow path, where sampling could be performed with a bucket or similar container. However, since the required construction as-builds had not been received at the time of the 2010 Permit renewal, and due to the extremely poor quality of the solution emanating from the seep, the Division determined that all buried pipeline conveyances for the Jupiter Seep must be constructed with secondary containment and the sampling point was relocated to the point of discharge into the Jupiter Pond. A Permit schedule of compliance item required construction of an approved design by 01 August 2012. An EDC for construction of a new Jupiter pipeline and evaporation cell pond, after remediation of contaminated soil in the area, was received 08 August 2012, and approved in June 2013. MIW-contaminated soil in the former Jupiter Pond area and in the drainage upstream of the pond was excavated to 6 to 12 feet deep, or to bedrock, whichever was shallower, and transported to the C-Pad Disposal Area. The Division approved leaving deeper contaminated soils in place in the footprint of the new lined evaporation cell. Construction of the new pipeline,
evaporation cell, and stormwater diversions, commenced in July 2013, and was completed in the summer of 2014.

As part of the 2013 EDC approval, a new seep connection box was constructed a short distance downstream from the buried seepage collection area to connect the existing single-walled 4-inch diameter collection pipe to the new double-walled Jupiter Seep MIW transfer pipeline. The seep connection box is located inside a precast concrete vault accessed via a manhole. The transfer pipeline, which consists of a 3-inch diameter HDPE primary pipe within a 6-inch diameter HDPE secondary pipe, runs from the seep connection box down to the new Jupiter Evaporation Cell, buried within crushed rock at least 1-foot beneath the existing ground surface. A leak detection port (JTP-LDP) for monitoring flow, if any, in the secondary pipe is located at the evaporation cell. Jupiter Seep MIW flow monitoring (JTP-F) is also required at the primary pipe discharge to the evaporation cell.

The original Jupiter Pond construction pre-dates the stabilization measures completed in June 2001. The pond was not modified with the 2008 minor modification. The 2001 stabilization work involved raising the existing downstream pond embankment elevation 7 feet with alluvial or equivalent oxide or mixed oxide/sulfide waste rock material and adding a geotextile- and riprap-lined spillway. The new fill material was compacted and as-built data indicate the specified minimum 92% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) was achieved at all test locations. No permeability testing was documented in the as-built report. The as-built capacity of the Jupiter Pond with raised embankment, to the 6679.45-foot AMSL elevation of the spillway invert, was 2.8 acre-feet (approximately 920,000 gal), which was considered adequate to contain the flow generated by a 100-year/24-hour storm event reporting to the upgradient catchment area. As with the conveyance pipeline, the Division has determined that the poor quality solution that could emanate from the seep mandates the Jupiter Pond be replaced with a double-lined and leak detected pond. The pond construction requirement is contained in the same schedule of compliance item that requires containment for the conveyance pipeline.

During October 2002, at the request of the Division, the Permittee excavated a stormwater diversion channel, measuring approximately 2 feet deep and 8 to 10 feet wide, along the east side of the drainage in which the Jupiter Pond is located. The diversion channel was designed to divert the 100-year/24-hour storm event flow from the adjacent western nose of the upper Lane City WRD and keep it from entering the Jupiter Pond catchment area. However, the diversion channel was covered during placement of alluvial cover on the Lane City WRD and its current effectiveness is unknown.

The Jupiter Evaporation Cell, which was constructed as part of the 2013 EDC approval, is lined with a 60-mil smooth HDPE secondary liner, overlain by an 80-
The subbase under the evaporation cell was built up with stabilizing layers of minus 4-inch- and minus 2-inch-diameter rock placed at the bottom of the excavation where contaminated soils were excavated, followed by placement of 12-inch thick lifts of non-PAG backfill, compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557), and a final approximately 3-inch thick liner bedding layer. Above the primary liner, the interior side walls of the evaporation cell are overlain with 12-oz/yd² non-woven geotextile, and the bottom of the evaporation cell is overlain with a layer of leveling sand, which is overlain in turn by 10-oz/yd² FabriNet Geocomposite® (composite geonet and geotextile material) to help distribute the MIW in the evaporation cell. The MIW solution is conveyed to a network of 6-inch diameter perforated CPE distribution pipes, enclosed in 12-oz/yd² non-woven geotextile, which sits on top of the FabriNet layer in the bottom of the evaporation cell. The evaporation cell is backfilled with a 36-inch thickness of non-PAG general fill compacted to 90% Modified Proctor (ASTM Method D1557), and covered with a 9-inch thickness of non-PAG riprap with a D₅₀ of 4 inches.

The Permit requires monitoring of the evaporation cell LCRS sump (JEC-LDS), and fluid depth and chemistry of the MIW contained in the evaporation cell via an 8-inch diameter HDPE vertical monitoring port (JEC) mounted within the evaporation cell.

Mollie Gibson Seep MIW: The Mollie Gibson Seep MIW is located on the north toe of the historic Millie Gibson ALD, upon which the A-Pad is constructed. Seepage was originally collected in four “ponds” – actually unlined surface depressions – identified as Mollie Gibson Ponds 1, 2, 3E and 3W and located downgradient of the ALD. An unlined stormwater pond, identified as Mollie Gibson Pond 4, was constructed at a later date adjacent the toe of the ALD where MIW collected.

Measures implemented during Temporary Closure documented in May 2002, included construction of 3-foot high diversion berms to divert stormwater flow around the seep area, backfilling topographic low areas to prevent surface ponding, regrading the north boundary of the ALD to minimize solution ponding, regrading two elevated benches on the ALD to maximize runoff, reduce ponding, and direct flow to Pond 4, raising the Pond 4 embankment by 6 feet using imported fill, and constructing an armored emergency spillway. Lime was mixed with soil and placed to a depth of approximately 12 inches over 40% of the Pond 4 base and allowed to form a crust. There is no record that the Pond 4 remediation measures included an engineered compaction or lining. A weir box, for solution flow measurement, was placed downstream of the seep but no lined containment was required for the seepage MIW, which continued to discharge to Pond 3W.

A minor modification was approved by the Division in April 2008, in preparation for resumption of mining and expansion of the Ruth Pit and for construction of the...
new Ruth and Jupiter waste rock facilities. To facilitate continued monitoring and quantification of flow from the Mollie Gibson Seep, the existing seepage collection area was modified and the sampling point relocated to accommodate expansion of the existing waste rock facilities. The seep area was excavated to improve alignment of the existing seepage route and a drainage trench was constructed to a new discharge point downstream. The excavated seep was lined with 12-oz/yd² geotextile and backfilled with gravel to direct collected flow to an excavated trench approximately 3 feet wide and 2 feet deep.

Following discussions with the Division to address the need for additional engineering designs for proper final closure of the Mollie Gibson MIW and associated ponds prior to overdumping with waste rock, the Permittee submitted three individual EDCs in May 2010. Following review and revision, the EDCs were approved in September 2010 for: 1) closure of Mollie Gibson Pond 4; 2) closure of Mollie Gibson ponds 1, 2, 3E, and 3W; and 3) construction of a new MIW seepage conveyance pipeline with secondary containment and a new double-lined and leak detected Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond.

Final closure of Mollie Gibson Pond 4 required treatment of contained MIW with lime to achieve a minimum pH of at least 6.5 SU prior to transport by water truck for introduction, in accordance with Intera MIW protocols as a proxy, to the Mill process circuit via the thickeners. Following MIW removal, the pond was backfilled with coarse limestone waste rock and alluvium covered with a final minimum 1-foot-thick compacted layer of alluvium fill compacted to at least 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) as confirmed with eight in-situ nuclear moisture-density tests. The compacted final cover was constructed with a minimum 1% north gradient to provide a free-draining surface.

Final closure of Mollie Gibson ponds 1, 2, 3E, and 3W required removal of approximately 88,000 gallons of Pond 3W MIW inventory with a vacuum truck for introduction into the Mill process circuit at an approximately 225 gpm approved limit. Ponds 1, 2, and 3E were dry at the time of closure. The ponds were backfilled with characterized alluvium in 1-foot loose lifts compacted to at least 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) with the final surfaces graded to drain at a minimum 1% to the north and west. The pond compaction was confirmed with a total of 37 nuclear moisture-density tests. The compacted pond fill thickness ranges from 6 feet in Pond 2 to 12 feet in Pond 1.

Following backfilling of the ponds, a compacted fill layer was constructed over the remaining Mollie Gibson surface area by placing alluvium in 1-foot loose lifts, compacted to at least 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) and graded to drain to the north and west at a minimum 1% gradient. The cover layer compaction was confirmed with 28 nuclear moisture-density tests.
Construction of the Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond required construction of an upgradient rockfall protection berm and stormwater diversion channel. The 1,400-foot long diversion channel, constructed as a 3-foot deep vee-shaped cut into native soil, will convey stormwater flows from the compacted cover Mollie Gibson area along a path between the southeast side of the pond and the future northwest toe of the expanded Mollie Gibson ALD into the natural drainage to the northeast. The channel is unlined except for the addition of riprap over a layer of 12-oz/yd² geotextile along a deepened 90-foot section located southwest of the pond and a 50-foot section at the intersection of the channel and the existing access road.

The rockfall protection berm is located between the future northwest toe of the expanded Mollie Gibson ALD and the stormwater diversion channel. The berm extends approximately 100 feet beyond the east and west limits of the Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond, which it is primarily designed to protect. The 6-foot high compacted earth berm was constructed of characterized borrow material. The design compaction was to be at least 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) but 95% maximum dry density was achieved as confirmed by 21 nuclear moisture-density tests.

The Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond has an elongated trapezoidal-shaped footprint with the long axis aligned southwest-northeast along the trace of the historic Mollie Gibson area drainage. The pond is approximately 10 feet deep and measures 550 to 600 feet long by 120 to 250 feet wide at the interior crest. The total storage capacity of the pond at the crest is 1.2 million gallons, and 850,000 gallons with a 2-foot freeboard, which is sufficient to contain the average MIW seepage flow rate plus the 100-year/24-hour storm event flow. The pond operating depth, using a post-overdumping water balance prediction, should vary seasonally between 2 and 4 feet with bird netting used instead of bird balls to enhance evaporation. For the period 2012 through 2015, Mollie Gibson Seep MIW inflow to the Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond (MG-TP monitoring point in the Permit) ranged from 0.2 gpm to 1 gpm.

Excavated native soils, placed in 1-foot thick loose lifts, were compacted to at least 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) to construct the pond embankment. The pond subbase was either scarified to a depth of 12 inches or filled with native soil, as necessary, which was also compacted to at least 95% maximum dry density. All pond construction compaction was confirmed with 48 nuclear moisture-density tests.

The prepared subbase was covered with a layer of 12-oz/yd² geotextile, a layer of AGRU 60 mil Super GripNet® HDPE for the secondary liner, and a layer of AGRU 80 mil smooth HDPE for the primary liner. The AGRU Super GripNet® liner material incorporates spikes on the bottom side for added friction and pegs on the top side to create an LCRS when covered with the smooth primary liner.
The LCRS reports to a subgrade collection sump located between the primary and secondary liners in the northeast corner of the pond. The sump measures approximately 4-feet square by 2-feet deep and is backfilled with drainage gravel enveloped in a layer of 12-oz/yd² geotextile. Collected solution may be evacuated from the sump through a 6-inch diameter HDPE riser, sandwiched between the liners, which daylights at the pond crest.

To prevent ponding of stormwater in a low lying area between the north embankment toe of the Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond and County Road 1146 (44A), backfill was placed and compacted to 95% maximum dry density. The surface of the compacted slope was constructed with a 2% to 3% gradient toward the existing roadside stormwater control channel. Approximately 800 feet of new roadside stormwater control channel, formed as a 2-foot deep vee-ditch, was constructed upstream of the pond to collect and divert roadside stormwater flows into the existing channel downstream of the pond.

Two monitor wells were installed in December 2010 adjacent to the downgradient (W-21A) and upgradient (W-21B) perimeter of the Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond. The wells replace monitor wells W-4A and W-4B, which were located closer to the upgradient ALD toe and were abandoned earlier in 2010 without prior Division authorization in anticipation of future waste rock overdumping in that area.

The existing single-wall seepage conveyance pipeline was replaced with a new 960-foot long, 3-inch diameter HDPE primary pipeline inside a 6-inch diameter HDPE secondary containment pipeline. Both pipelines pass through a pipeline protection berm to discharge at the southwest corner of the Mollie Gibson Seepage Management Pond. The new pipeline was placed 3 feet below ground surface within a trench with a 12-inch thick compacted (90% maximum dry density) subbase and backfilled with general fill compacted to at least 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). Compaction was verified with seven nuclear moisture density tests of the subbase and 20 tests of the backfill.

The new primary conveyance pipeline was connected to the existing 4-inch diameter perforated seepage collection pipeline with a short piece of perforated 3-inch diameter pipeline and stainless steel clamps embedded within geotextile-wrapped gravel. The downgradient limit of the gravel was bermed with compacted bentonite-amended native soil to form a low permeability catchment to direct seepage into the conveyance pipeline. Inspection of the existing collection system indicated no damage had occurred as a result of construction activities.

On 25 August 2017, the Division approved an EDC and FPPC for the removal and closure of the Mollie Gibson ALM Material that is planned to be mined during the 2017 expansion of the Ruth West pit, Ruth West 4. This material will be relocated
to an additional 17-acre disposal area within the Jupiter Dump, specifically designated for ALM disposal. Once placement has been completed, the ALM material will be covered by a minimum 10-foot thick layer of non-PAG waste rock as an interim cover for the winter months. Under the current mine plan, the continued expansion of the Ruth West pit, Ruth West 5, will occur in 2019. The additional Mollie Gibson ALM material will also be placed within the 17-acre designated ALM placement area. Once placement is complete, the area will be covered with a 60-mil LLDPE geomembrane liner and will be overlain with a minimum of 3-feet of growth medium of non-PAG waste rock as liner protection.

Any ALM remaining above the Ruth Pit Rim will be graded to prevent ponding of meteoric water and covered with a geomembrane liner plus 3-feet of non-PAG overliner material, or a 12-inch thick layer of compacted LHCSL covered by a minimum of 5-feet of non-PAG waste rock. Additionally, as this area is also an active haul road, a 2-foot layer of non-PAG wasterock will be placed over the remaining exposed ALM outside the pit perimeter berm until such time as the geomembrane liner can be placed.

ALM remaining in the Ruth Pit wall following mining will be characterized and stabilized in place as warranted, based in part on the results of the updated Pit Lake Study, which was submitted in early 2017.

**Lane City WRD Closure:** The Lane City WRD is an historic waste rock storage facility constructed parallel to Gleason Creek along the southern creek bank. The dump is roughly linear along a north-northwest alignment, measures approximately 4,500 feet long by 400 feet wide, and has a maximum height of about 150 feet above the toe on the creek bank. The Lane City WRD contains large amounts of potentially acid generating (PAG) sulfide waste rock and is situated perpendicular to smaller drainages reporting to Gleason Creek.

Several partial reclamation efforts occurred from 2001, which included regrading of slopes, construction of drop channel structures to minimize erosion, and local placement of an average 6-inch thick alluvium cover followed by seeding. A 2007 Permit schedule of compliance item required a CAP to determine a source of poor groundwater quality in downgradient monitor well R-A. The work related to the Well R-A CAP was completed in late 2010 and included additional slope contouring, diversion of upgradient tributaries around the WRD, placement of a compacted low permeability soil layer along the upgradient face of the WRD to prevent infiltration of surface run-on, and verification of the minimum 6-inch thick cover placement over the entire WRD surface. Additional alluvium will be placed in areas identified with thin cover prior to final seeding. The WRD will require continued vegetation monitoring and enhancement and management of surface acid rock drainage. A final closure report for the Lane City WRD was finally submitted 10 January 2012 and approved by the Division 31 May 2012 with a provision that
the WRD must be monitored quarterly for acid-rock-drainage (ARD) staining. Stained areas must be repaired with additional cover within 90 days of discovery.

**Plan for Use of Mine-Impacted Waters - The Four-Step Protocol:** A key requirement and outcome of the 1997 Consent Agreement is development and implementation of what has become known as the “Four-Step Protocol” (the Protocol). The Protocol enables the use of site historic Mine-Impacted Waters and impacted waters from other sources as Robinson Mill make-up water while meeting water quality discharge limits at the Giroux Wash Tailings Impoundment. Based on sampling and characterization of MIWs, the Protocol is comprised of the following steps, which were originally described in Section 5.2 of the “Work Plan: Robinson Operation”, attached to the 1997 Consent Agreement as Exhibit ‘F’, and as modified in February 2011 for consistency with current regulation and the Permit:

1) “System Characterization”, which includes but is not limited to, sample collection, laboratory analysis, and metallurgical evaluation to determine process options and management issues. A sampling and analysis plan must be submitted to the Division for review and approval prior to characterization field work;

2) “Bench Scale Testing”, to determine the maximum mixing rate for use of each MIW in the mill circuit that will maintain Permit compliance, using representative samples collected in step 1 above. Cumulative effects of other MIW contributions must be accounted for by adding new samples of each previously approved MIW to the mill process circuit sample at a ratio representative of the maximum anticipated rate of addition. Maximum individual MIW addition rates may need to be reduced to prevent exceedances at the BOC;

3) “Mill Circuit Use”, which requires submittal of Bench Scale Testing data to the Division, Division approval, a 5-day written notice to the Division of the intent to use the MIW in the mill circuit at the established rate, fortnightly (every two weeks) sampling at the outfall to the Giroux Wash Tailings Storage Facility (TSSEP for WAD cyanide only) and at the Barge Operating Channel (TS-SBOC for Profile I-R) for two months and quarterly thereafter, with 14-day turnaround and all data to be submitted in the next quarterly monitoring report. As warranted upon receipt of analytical results, adjustments shall be made to maintain compliance with Permit conditions; and

4) “Final Water Source Management”, which requires that, once MIW is removed from a particular source or contained pursuant to Division approval, the MIW source area shall be stabilized in accordance with a Division-approved FPPC followed by submittal of a final closure report to the Division for review and approval.
Previously approved maximum rates for introduction of the Kimbley MIW, Intera MIW, and ABC MIW to the mill circuit were replaced in June 2013 with revised maximum introduction rates determined by the first Division approved MIW cumulative bench test. The Ruth Pit MIW was also included in the same cumulative bench test, but its maximum introduction rate remained unchanged. That cumulative bench test did not include the Liberty Pit MIW or the Mollie Gibson MIW, so those MIWs may not be introduced to the mill circuit concurrently with other MIWs until a cumulative bench test that includes them is approved. The previously approved maximum introduction rates are still in effect for the Liberty Pit MIW and Mollie Gibson MIW, provided that the MIW character has not worsened significantly, and provided that each MIW is introduced to the mill at a time when no other MIWs are being introduced.

**Deep Ruth Shaft Cover and Final Closure:** The minor modification approved in April 2008, for resumption of mining and expansion of the Ruth Pit and construction of the new Ruth and Jupiter waste rock facilities, contained a conceptual design for placing a permanent cover over the Deep Ruth Shaft to allow overdumping by the expanded waste rock facilities. The conceptual design was determined by the Permittee to be impractical and uneconomic for implementation. Subsequently, an alternative design and FPPC for the Deep Ruth Shaft were submitted as a separate EDC, along with the EDC for closure of the Mollie Gibson ponds, in May 2010. Following design revisions requested by the Division, the EDC was approved by the Division in September 2010.

Little detailed information about the Deep Ruth Shaft construction exists. The shaft collar opening measured approximately 32 feet 4 inches long by 7 feet 6 inches wide and was rimmed with a thick layer of concrete for which construction details are unknown. In the area of the shaft, alluvium extends from surface to a depth of approximately 25 feet and overlies limestone that extends at least 250 feet further below the alluvium. Ruth Mineralized Block groundwater occurs at a depth of approximately 330 feet below ground surface.

In accordance with the approved FPPC and based on information in the as-built and final closure report dated 20 January 2011, the Deep Ruth Shaft was backfilled to surface elevation during October 2010 with characterized Ely Limestone waste rock. The limestone may help neutralize water in the shaft that has exhibited slightly low pH values historically. A total of 28,350 tons of nominal <18-inch diameter backfill material was placed using direct dumping and a conveyor belt. The tonnage placed was nearly 90% more than the original design estimate of 15,000 tons and is believed to be related to variations in shaft dimension at depth and migration of backfill material into lateral drifts adjoining the shaft. The volume exceedance is considered a reasonable indication the entire shaft volume has been backfilled.
Following placement of backfill, a reinforced concrete shaft cover slab was constructed in accordance with the design specification. The slab measures 3 feet thick, 36 feet 4 inches long, and 11 feet 6 inches wide to create a minimum 2-foot overlap on all sides of the shaft collar and support loads generated by a minimum 300-foot thick cover of overdumped waste rock. Rebar was placed in both directions along the top and bottom of the slab on 12-inch centers. Concrete cylinder testing for 7-, 14-, and 28-day intervals, indicates the finished concrete exhibited 14-day compressive strength in excess of 4,000 psi. The finished slab was covered with a minimum 5-foot thick compacted layer of alluvium to protect it from rock damage during overdumping.

The steel headframe, hoist equipment, and other related infrastructure were dismantled and removed, without Division knowledge or approval, during the period 2008-2009. The final closure report indicates the headframe was dismantled and salvaged by V&S Consulting of Duluth, Minnesota, but the disposition of other equipment was not specified.

Ruth-Kimbley Pit Dewatering Pipeline System: A Pit Dewatering Pipeline System was constructed, probably no earlier than 1997, to convey MIW from the Ruth and Kimbley pits for use in the Robinson Mill. The Ruth-Kimbley pipeline system consists of three primary pipeline sections:

- The Kimbley Pit Dewatering Pipeline; a 3,050-foot long section of 10-inch diameter HDPE SDR 11 pipe that conveys MIW from the Kimbley Pit to the Ruth Booster Pump;
- The Ruth Pit Dewatering Pipeline; a 3,500-foot long section of 12-inch diameter HDPE SDR 11 pipe that conveys MIW from the Ruth Pit to the Ruth Booster Pump; and
- The Ruth Booster Pump-to-Robinson Mill Pipeline; a 21,000-foot long pipeline, which conveys MIW from the Ruth Booster Pump to the Robinson Mill for use in the process circuit and is comprised of multiple sections of HDPE pipe (SDR 7.3 and/or 11) ranging in diameter from 10-inch to 20-inch, with the smallest diameter at the Mill-end of the pipeline.

As-built records are available for dewatering pipeline construction beginning with the Kimbley Pit Dewatering Pipeline, completed in February 2009, with additional modification in January 2010. The Permit limits the flow rate of each MIW introduced to the mill circuit to either the maximum flow approved via the Protocol, or the flow rate equivalent to 90% of the lowest maximum pressure rating for the conveyance piping used, whichever rate is lower.

An EDC modification was approved by the Division in March 2010 to upgrade an existing 2,100-foot long section of 10-inch diameter HDPE SDR 11 pipe to 14-inch diameter HDPE pipe (SDR 7.3 and/or 11). This change may allow an increase in
system pumping capacity but the flow rate must not exceed Permit limits. However, testing in accordance with the Protocol limited the maximum MIW introduction rate at the Mill to 1,195 gpm for Kimbley Pit MIW (30 January 2009 report) and 4,332 gpm for Ruth Pit MIW (16 November 2010 report). Deteriorating Kimbley Pit water quality during 2010 prompted the Division to rescind the pumping authorization for the Kimbley Pit MIW and require a new cumulative Four-Step Protocol to determine a new maximum pumping rate for Kimbley MIW to the Mill prior to any further pumping from the Kimbley Pit Lake.

An EDC modification was approved by the Division in February 2013 for an upgraded road crossing over the Ruth Pit MIW pipeline to provide heavy equipment access to a new fuel island located between the Ruth and Liberty Pits west of the old Kennecott buildings. The 16-inch diameter HDPE Ruth Pit MIW pipeline is placed inside a 30-inch diameter SDR 11 HDPE secondary pipe where it goes under the road. An 18-inch diameter potable water pipeline and a 30-inch diameter HDPE non-MIW dewatering pipeline from the Ruth Pit area are also present at the same road crossing and are placed within 30-inch diameter and 42-inch diameter SDR 11 HDPE secondary pipes, respectively. The secondary pipes are surrounded by pipe bedding material compacted to 92% of maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557), which is overlain by a minimum 5-foot layer of random fill compacted to 90% of maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). The road wearing course is constructed on top of the 5-foot fill layer. The ABC leach pad draindown MIW pipeline is in this general vicinity also, but is believed to be slightly south of this road crossing buried under at least 5 feet of compacted fill.

An August 2013 EDC approval by the Division (see below) to tie in a Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline to the Ruth North dewatering pipeline, which connects to the main Ruth MIW pipeline, required upgrades to provide secondary containment for air vents and drain valves on the existing Ruth MIW pipeline between the booster pump station above the southwest rim of the Ruth Pit (RBPS-SWR) and the mill. At the air vents and drain valves, 35-gallon HDPE stock tanks were installed to collect any spillage and drainage, respectively. A vacuum truck collects and conveys the spillage and drainage to the mill. The RBPS-SWR pump station was also outfitted with 80-mil HDPE-lined secondary containment installed on a subbase constructed with a 4-inch thick layer of general fill compacted to 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) over an 8-inch thick layer of subgrade compacted to 90% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). The lined secondary containment has a capacity greater than 110% of the 4,512-gallon steel primary booster tank.

An EDC was approved by the Division, in October of 2016, for the realignment and modification to the Ruth MIW dewatering pipeline. Heavy duty horizontal centrifugal dewatering pumps were sized to provide a flow rate between 1,200 to 2,500 gpm to a feed tank located in the northern saddle of the current pit configuration between the eastern and western portions of the Ruth Pit. The 21,000
gallon MIW feed tank will contain agitators to maintain consistent mixing and prevent the deposition of solids in the feed tank. The feed tank will be mounted with the pump skid that contain a high pressure, multi-stage pump capable of pumping MIW to the Mill without the addition of booster pumps. The pumps will discharge into a 12-inch steel pipeline that extends to an approximate elevation of 6,975 feet at which point the pipeline changes to a 16-inch HDPE 4710 SDR 7.3 pipe that continues to the Ruth Pit crest elevation of 7,300 feet. A new segment of HDPE pipeline will be constructed, in two phases, to convey Ruth MIW from the in-pit pipeline, around the A-Pad and down to the existing Ruth MIW pipeline to the southwest of A-Pad.

Kimbley Pit Dewatering System: An EDC modification was approved by the Division in August 2013 for a new Kimbley Pit temporary dewatering pipeline. The temporary pipeline was located on the east, south, and southwest sides of the Kimbley Pit and on the north side of the Ruth Pit. Because the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline was located within the ultimate footprint of the expanded Kimbley Pit, it was intended for temporary use only until a more permanent pipeline located largely outside of the ultimate Kimbley Pit was approved and constructed. In accordance with the Permit, the temporary pipeline was decommissioned and permanently closed before 01 February 2014 pursuant to a Division-approved FPPC.

The 8-inch diameter HDPE Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline conveyed acidic Kimbley Pit MIW from the Kimbley Pit Lake and nearby dewatering well RE-1P to a point on the north side of the Ruth Pit where the pipeline tied into the existing 14-inch diameter HDPE Ruth Pit North dewatering pipeline (which was already connected to north Ruth dewatering wells RW-22 and AGT-12). An approximately 4,000 foot section of the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline was contained within a 24-inch diameter HDPE secondary pipe to convey any leakage from the primary pipeline back into the Kimbley Pit. The Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline, and the Ruth MIW pipelines it tied into, were primarily placed on the ground surface, but were buried at road crossings where they are contained within a secondary pipe or culvert, and are covered by at least 5 feet of fill compacted to 95% maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557). All wells connected to the pipelines are protected from backflow contamination with check valves. No air vents or drain valves were installed on the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline, but several air vents and drain valves located on the existing main Ruth MIW pipeline required upgrading with secondary containment as a result of the tie-in with the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline.

An EDC approved by the Division in November 2013 authorized the removal of the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline and use of the same rerouted piping material for construction of the more permanent Kimbley Pit Dewatering Pipeline (KPDP), mentioned above. Because non-corrosion-resistant components of the RBPS-SWR booster pump station (e.g., a mild steel surge tank) were not upgraded
as previously required, the Permittee agreed to a new Permit limit requiring that the Kimbley MIW shall be pumped to the mill only when an equal or greater flow rate of the neutral pH Ruth MIW is being pumped to the mill through the RBPS-SWR booster pump station.

Like the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline, the KPDP consisted of an 8-inch diameter, SDR 7.3, HDPE pipeline. The KPDP was 9,878 feet long, and followed a more northerly course than the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline. The pipeline ran from the Kimbley Pit Lake barge up the Wedge Pit ramp, and around the northeast and northwest sides of the South B-leach pad, to a tie-in with the existing 14-inch diameter HDPE Ruth Pit North dewatering pipeline near the northeast corner of A-Pad. Two short spur pipelines tied into the KPDP from Kimbley dewatering well AGT-9P (which was unrelated to the Alta Gold Tailings, and was later mined through without proper well abandonment during Kimbley Pit mining) and Ruth North dewatering well K-3P. Another Kimbley dewatering well, RE-1P, was not connected to the KPDP, but discharged directly into the Kimbley Pit near the pump barge via a 2-inch diameter HDPE pipe. RE-1P pumping was allowed only when the Kimbley Pit barge pump was pumping Kimbley MIW to the mill via the KPDP.

Unlike the Kimbley temporary dewatering pipeline, the KPDP was a single-walled surface pipeline, except at three haul-road crossings where it was double-walled and buried a minimum of 5 feet below the road surface with non-PAG general fill compacted to 95% of maximum dry density (ASTM Method D1557) overlying a 12-inch thick native soil base that was also compacted to 95% of maximum dry density. The KPDP and all wells tied into it were equipped with check valves to prevent backflow. Air vents at local high points and drain valves at local low points were equipped with secondary containment tubs to prevent and collect leakage. Drainage flow and spillage from the secondary containment tubs are evacuated into a vacuum truck as needed and transported to a tailings thickener at the mill. All KPDP pipe fittings were constructed of corrosion-resistant materials because of the acidic character of the Kimbley Pit dewatering water.

An EDC was approved by the Division in December 2014, after the completion of mining in the Kimbley Pit, for modification of the Ruth MIW pipeline and repurposing of much of the KPDP to create the new Ruth South MIW Dewatering Pipeline (RSDP). The RSDP utilizes the existing 8-inch diameter KPDP to convey dewatering water from dewatering well AGT-12P eastward (opposite direction from the previous westward uphill pumping of Kimbley Pit MIW through the same pipe) down to the east side of the Kimbley Pit, then up to the new Ruth East in-pit booster pump station located on a divide between the south side of the Kimbley Pit and the northeast side of the Ruth East Pit. Incidentally, well AGT-12P is unrelated to the Alta Gold Tailings material. At the Ruth East booster station, a 14-inch diameter dewatering pipeline from the Ruth and Ruth East pits joins the RSDP. The RSDP continues up and out of the Ruth East Pit, through the new South Route.
Booster Pump Station, and along the south rim to a relocated RBPS-SWR booster pump station (approximately 800 feet southwest of the previous RBPS-SWR location), where it joins the existing 14-inch diameter HDPE Ruth MIW pipeline. Dewatering wells K-3P, RW-22, and RE-1P may also be connected to the RSDP, using check valves to prevent backflow into the wells. The RSDP is located on the surface, except where it is sleeved in secondary pipe under haul road crossings. Air vent valves and drain valves at high and low points, respectively, are outfitted with 35-gallon HDPE stock tubs for secondary containment. Both booster pump stations that are located outside of the pits, RBPS-SWR and the South Route Booster Pump Station, are constructed with the same materials, specifications, and capacities as the previous RBPS-SWR, except a 60-mil HDPE liner is used instead of 80-mil. Isolation and check valves at the booster pump stations are corrosion resistant.

With construction of the RSDP, portions of the previous Ruth and Kimbley dewatering pipelines, and the previous RBPS-SWR pump station, will be permanently closed pursuant to regulation.

**Liberty Pit Dewatering System:** An EDC was approved by the Division in June 2011 to construct a pump and pipeline system to remove impounded water from the Liberty Pit. As discussed in the section below, the Small Liberty Pit Lake water exhibits low pH and elevated metal concentrations. The adjacent Main Liberty Pit Lake exhibits better water quality but must be evacuated in anticipation of a resumption of mining in the Liberty Pit.

Four-Step Protocol testing of the combined waters was performed in parallel to the EDC design development. The bench testing determined that a blend of 25% (125 gpm) Small Liberty Pit Lake water and 75% (375 gpm) Main Liberty Pit Lake water could be introduced into the mill circuit at a rate of 500 gpm without creating an adverse effect on water quality at the BOC. The factor limiting the test flow rate to 500 gpm at the proposed mix ratio is an exceedance of the Profile I reference value for fluoride at higher bench scale consumption rates.

The dewatering system allows comingling of the two source waters into a single pipeline that connects to the Ruth-Kimbley dewatering pipeline. The design accommodates a maximum pumping rate of 900 gpm from the Main Liberty Pit Lake and 300 gpm from the Small Liberty Pit Lake, far in excess of the authorized pumping rate based on the Four-Step Protocol results. The system design is comprised of a standard vertical turbine pump mounted on an existing barge in the Main Liberty Pit and a small stainless steel vertical turbine pump mounted on an existing barge in the Small Liberty Pit Lake. Each pump is equipped with instantaneous flow rate and cumulative volume flow meters.

The Main Pit Lake pump is connected to a 10-inch diameter, 5,000 foot long HDPE pipeline that ties into a skid-mounted, self-priming, in-line booster pump connected
to the Ruth-Kimbley dewatering pipeline. The booster pump provides additional injection pressure of approximately 85 pounds per square inch. The Small Pit Lake pump is connected to a 6-inch diameter, 200-foot long HDPE pipeline that connects to the 10-inch diameter line from the Main Pit Lake pump. All pipeline connections are equipped with valves to prevent backflow along the system.

**Pit Lake Study and Ecological Risk Assessment:** A pit lake study (PLS) and screening level ecological risk assessment (SLERA) were submitted to the Division on 30 August 2005 to fulfill a Permit schedule of compliance item. However, based on actual conditions experienced since submittal of the 2005 Plan and changes to the mine plan, another Permit schedule of compliance item required the Permittee to submit to the Division, by 01 August 2011 for review and approval, a new PLS and SLERA for all potential pit lakes or impounded surface waters that may form as a result of mining or related activities. The revised PLS and SLERA were received 12 July 2011, but the 02 August 2011 Division response rejected them as being inadequate. Further revisions of the PLS and/or SLERA were received 17 October 2011, 12 July 2012, 10 October 2012, 15 April 2013, 04 June 2014, and 21 August 2014. All were also rejected as being inadequate, as they failed to address previously documented Division concerns. Among the concerns was that the predicted water quality for some pit lakes (e.g., Liberty, Kimbley, and Tripp-Veteran) exceeded Division Profile III reference values, which are based on ecological toxicity data, and therefore, a more detailed ecological risk assessment (ERA) was required to go beyond the previous SLERAs. The next pit lake study and ERA, dated 15 April 2015, were provisionally approved by the Division on 17 February 2016. As a result of the PLS and ERA approval, the previously approved Interim Mine Plan (described below in the Kimbley Pit and Waste Rock Management Plan sections) was no longer necessary, and was terminated by the Division on 17 February 2016.

Beginning with the June 2011 renewal, the Permit has also included a requirement for submittal of an updated PLS and ERA for review and approval with each application for renewal of the Permit and with each application to modify the Permit that could affect the PLS and ERA. In 2015, the Permittee developed a new mine plan that will focus all future mining in the Ruth East and Ruth West Pits and abandon previous plans for further mining in the Liberty and Tripp-Veteran Pits. Accordingly, an interim PLS was approved by the Division in August 2016 to allow commencement of the RE-3 and RW-4 expansions of the Ruth East and Ruth West Pits, respectively.

The 2005 PLS and SLERA identified existing and future pit lakes in the Liberty Pit, Ruth Pit, and Kimbley Pit, and a future pit lake in the Tripp-Veteran Pit. The Tripp-Veteran Pit had not yet penetrated the water table in 2005, but did shortly thereafter. Ten years later, when the 2015 PLS and ERA were submitted, a small lake had formed in the Tripp-Veteran Pit, the Liberty Main Pit Lake and Liberty East Pit Lake had been dewatered, limited additional mining had occurred in the
Liberty Pit, the Ruth Pit Lake had been dewatered in support of major deepening of the Ruth West Pit, the Ruth East Pit had been created, and the Star Pointer Pit had been backfilled. Also by 2015, the Kimbley Pit Lake had been dewatered, the Kimbley Pit had been deepened and then backfilled above the predicted groundwater rebound level, and the Wedge Pit had been created and also backfilled above the predicted groundwater rebound level.

The 2015 PLS and ERA was improved over previous versions in including a greater amount of humidity cell test (HCT) data, groundwater elevations and water quality data from several new monitoring wells, geochemical model calibration with historic pit lake water quality data from the Liberty Main and Liberty East Pit Lakes, comparisons of pit lake model results and backfill groundwater geochemical model results for the Kimbley and Wedge Pits, and sensitivity analyses for the thickness of pit wall damaged rock zones used in the model, an unmixed scenario for the combined Ruth Pit Lake, and a rapid filling scenario of the Liberty East Pit Lake. In the following sections, each pit is described separately with regard to predicted pit lakes, predicted ecological risk, potential for groundwater degradation, and other related topics.

An EDC was approved by the Division in April 2015 to install nine monitoring wells, four of which are associated with the PLS: three in the predicted groundwater outflow zone for the Ruth West Pit (P-1A, P-1B, and P-2), and one in the predicted groundwater outflow zone for the Tripp-Veteran Pit (P-3). Two of the other approved monitoring wells (W-12R3 and R-CR) are replacements for wells that are being mined through in the Ruth Pit (W-12RR and R-C). The other three approved wells are replacements for W-9A and W-9B, associated with the proposed Juniper MIW collection system (JUN-1, JUN-2, and JUN-3).

**Liberty Pit:** During the 2010 Permit renewal, the Liberty Pit contained a larger ‘Main’ pit lake and a shallow ‘East’ pit lake. The Liberty East Pit Lake exhibited poor water quality in the form of elevated metal concentrations and low pH (2-3 SU), while the Liberty Main Pit Lake exhibited much better water quality with circumneutral pH. To bring the East pit lake into compliance, the Division added a schedule of compliance item to the Permit requiring construction of an approved system to neutralize or eliminate the Liberty East Pit Lake and a demonstration that impoundment of surface water by the Liberty East Pit Lake has been minimized by 31 August 2011. This led to construction of the approved Liberty Pit dewatering system (see above) and construction of a 100-year/24-hour stormwater diversion structure above the southeast rim of the Liberty Pit. The Division approved commissioning of the dewatering system on 08 September 2011, and received a satisfactory as-built report for the stormwater diversion on 12 June 2012. Subsequent mining in the Liberty Pit modified the pit in the vicinity of the previous Liberty Main Pit Lake. As of 2016, the Liberty Main Pit Lake has reformed, but the Liberty East Pit Lake has remained dry.
An EDC to install three new monitoring wells (W-23, W-24, and W-25) in the vicinity of the Liberty Pit was approved by the Division in March 2013. The new wells were required by the Division to provide more data on groundwater quality and static water levels for input into future revisions of the PLS.

The 2015 PLS predicts that both the Liberty Main and Liberty East Pit Lakes will represent evaporative sinks with no groundwater outflow. The 2015 PLS predicts that the final stage for the Liberty Main Pit Lake will be reached at 6,550 feet AMSL (26 acres) 115 years after the end of mining, and the final stage for the Liberty East Pit Lake will be reached at 6,468 feet AMSL (40 acres) approximately 150 years after the end of mining. The long predicted filling time is based on hydrologic data indicating that a low permeability zone on the south side of the Liberty Pit isolates the pit from the productive aquifer of the adjoining South Hydrogeologic Block. Pit lake water quality modeling predicts that all constituents will meet Division Profile III reference values in the Liberty Main Pit Lake, except fluoride at 4.8 mg/L. For the Liberty East Pit Lake, modeling for the normal filling scenario, without rapid filling or other mitigation, predicts poor water quality with Profile III exceedances for pH (4.76 SU), aluminum (9.2 mg/L), cadmium (16 mg/L), copper (4.0 mg/L), fluoride (14 mg/L), thallium (0.037 mg/L), and TDS (15,000 mg/L). Rapid filling the Liberty East Pit Lake with clean groundwater pumped from the South Hydrogeologic Block over a three- to six-month period is predicted to result in much improved water quality, with lower magnitude Profile III exceedances for cadmium (0.18 mg/L) and fluoride (4.8 mg/L).

The 2015 ERA includes an identification of representative wildlife species (big game species, upland game species, other game species, small mammals and bats, and nongame birds) that may utilize the Robinson pit lakes for water. The ERA compares toxicity criteria for the selected wildlife species with the predicted pit lake water concentrations to assess ecological risk. Humans and livestock were excluded from the risk assessment because the Permittee plans to use fences to restrict their access to all pit lakes. The 2015 ERA concludes that the predicted concentrations of Profile III constituents in the Liberty Main Pit Lake and the Liberty East Pit Lake, rapid filling scenario, will not exceed species-specific toxicity criteria for any of the selected wildlife species. However, the Liberty East Pit Lake, normal filling scenario, is predicted to present a low-moderate risk to some terrestrial species for aluminum and thallium, and a moderate risk to several terrestrial species and a few avian species for thallium. The Division will require mitigation of the Liberty East Pit Lake, either via the rapid filling scenario or another mitigation strategy, to eliminate such ecological risks.

The 2015 PLS and ERA is now obsolete for the Liberty Pit, because it includes additional mining in the Liberty Pit that is no longer part of the mine plan as of 2016. Therefore, a schedule of compliance item added to the Permit as part of the August 2016 Division approval of an expansion of the Ruth East and Ruth West...
Pits requires a revised PLS and ERA, in part to update the model for the Liberty Pit.

**Tripp-Veteran Pit:** The historic Tripp Pit (east) and Veteran Pit (west) have now merged into one large pit. The eastern portion of the Tripp-Veteran Pit is partly backfilled above the predicted water rebound level. A small pit lake was present in the bottom of the pit for several years, but was dry in 2015. The 2015 PLS predicts the final stage of the Tripp-Veteran Pit Lake will be reached at 6,102 feet AMSL (11 acres) approximately 23 years after the end of mining at the site. Pit lake water quality modeling predicts that all constituents will meet Division Profile III reference values in the Tripp-Veteran Pit Lake, except fluoride at 2.1 mg/L. The 2015 ERA concludes that the predicted concentrations of Profile III constituents in the Tripp-Veteran Pit Lake will not exceed species-specific toxicity criteria for any of the selected wildlife species.

The 2015 PLS predicts that the Tripp-Veteran Pit Lake will include an outflow of 66 gpm to groundwater southwest of the pit. The predicted pit lake water quality is better than the background groundwater reference values for the Tripp-Veteran Hydrogeologic Block, but exceeds background groundwater reference values for sulfate (predicted value 900 mg/L, reference value 500 mg/L) and TDS (predicted value 1,300 mg/L, reference value 1,000 mg/L) for the Giroux Wash Hydrogeologic Block, which is located a short distance to the southwest of the pit in the predicted groundwater outflow zone. In follow-up to this predicted groundwater exceedance, the April 2015 EDC approval (described above) included the installation of new monitoring well P-3, located a short distance southwest of the Tripp-Veteran Pit, to obtain additional groundwater elevation and water quality data in the predicted pit lake groundwater outflow zone. Monitoring well P-3 was installed in June 2015, and as of March/April 2016, had a static water elevation of 6,034 feet AMSL and good water quality that meets all Giroux Wash Hydrogeologic Block reference values. Well P-3 will continue to be monitored for any impacts related to the predicted Tripp-Veteran Pit Lake groundwater outflow zone.

The 2015 PLS and ERA is now obsolete for the Tripp-Veteran Pit, because it includes additional mining in the Tripp-Veteran Pit that is no longer part of the mine plan as of 2017, and because the new data from new monitoring well P-3 must be incorporated into the PLS. Therefore, a schedule of compliance item added to the Permit as part of the August 2016 Division approval of an expansion of the Ruth East and Ruth West Pits requires a revised PLS and ERA, in part to update the model for the Tripp-Veteran Pit. The revised PLs and ERA were submitted to the Division in early 2017.

**Ruth West and Ruth East Pits:** In their final configuration the Ruth West Pit and Ruth East Pit will be joined above 6,550 feet AMSL via a saddle on an internal bedrock ridge that separates the lower portions of the two pits. The 2015 PLS
predicts the formation of two separate pit lakes for the first 19 years after mining and dewatering cease, and then the Ruth West Pit Lake will begin spilling over the 6,550-foot saddle into the Ruth East Pit Lake. The combined Ruth Pit Lake will fill quickly, reaching 95% full (6,585 feet AMSL) 28 years after the cessation of mining and dewatering, and 100% full (6,633 feet AMSL) approximately 70 years after mining and dewatering cease. The filling rate will be rapid because both pits penetrate the carbonate aquifer of the South Hydrogeologic Block in their south walls. The South Block will contribute over 80% of the water in the combined Ruth Pit Lake.

The Ruth East Pit is separated from the Kimbley Pit by another bedrock saddle with final elevation of 6,550 feet AMSL. If the Kimbley Pit was not backfilled above the final stage elevation of the combined Ruth Pit Lake, the Kimbley Pit Lake would ultimately join with the Ruth Pit Lake, forming a large Ruth/Kimbley Pit Lake with a combined area of 279 acres. However, the Kimbley Pit was backfilled in 2015 and 2016, thus precluding a 41-acre pit lake in the Kimbley Pit. Therefore, the combined Ruth West/Ruth East Pit Lake, without the Kimbley Pit Lake, will cover a total area of 237 acres (146-acre Ruth West lobe, plus 92-acre Ruth East lobe). The Kimbley Pit is described separately below.

Owing to the large contribution of clean water from the South Hydrogeologic Block, the 2015 PLS predicts good water quality both for the separate Ruth West and Ruth East Pit Lakes before they combine, and for the later combined Ruth Pit Lake, with no exceedances of Division Profile III reference values. Therefore, the separate and combined Ruth pit lakes will not exceed species-specific toxicity criteria for any of the selected wildlife species.

The 2015 PLS predicts that the combined Ruth Pit Lake will include a groundwater outflow zone, which will flow at a predicted rate of 123 gpm to the north and northwest from the north side of the Ruth West Pit. The groundwater outflow will occur in areas of the north pit wall where the Ruth West Pit has intercepted the Pennsylvanian Ely Limestone Formation and historic underground workings. The underground workings are connected to the previously capped Deep Ruth Shaft, which is now buried beneath the Ruth WRD. The partially caved underground workings are exposed in the Ruth West Pit walls and are not safely accessible. The 2015 PLS predicts that the water in the Ruth pit lakes will not exceed any Profile I groundwater reference values, and no groundwater degradation is predicted to result from the Ruth West Pit groundwater outflow zone. As part of the April 2015 EDC approval, three new monitoring wells (P-1A, P-1B, and P-2) were installed in the predicted outflow zone north and northwest of the Ruth West Pit to monitor groundwater elevations and water quality before and after formation of the Ruth West Pit Lake. Monitoring results from wells P-1A, P-1B, and P-2 in 2015-2016 indicate exceedances of applicable hydrogeologic block reference values (Ruth South Block for P-1A and P-1B, and Ruth Mineralized Block for P-2) for iron, magnesium, manganese, sulfate, and TDS before formation of the Ruth West Pit
Lake. These wells will continue to be monitored for impacts related to the predicted Ruth West Pit Lake groundwater outflow zone.

In August 2016, the Division provisionally approved an interim PLS for expansions RE-3 and RW-4 of the Ruth East and Ruth West Pits, respectively. The RE-3 expansion will lower the ultimate Ruth East Pit floor to an elevation of 6,100 feet AMSL. The RW-4 expansion will lower the Ruth West Pit floor to an elevation of 5,950 feet AMSL. The 2016 interim PLS includes representative static characterization of the ultimate pit walls of the Ruth East and Ruth West Pits after the RE-3 and RW-4 expansions, but does not include new HCT data or comprehensive pit lake modeling, because of the short timeframe before commencement of the new pit expansion. In accordance with a new schedule of compliance item added to the Permit with the August 2016 Division approval, a fully revised PLS and ERA, including new HCT data and revised modeling, shall be submitted by 30 April 2017. Among other changes, the revised PLS and ERA must incorporate new data from monitoring wells P-1A, P-1B, and P-2 located in the predicted Ruth West Pit groundwater outflow zone. Based on a preliminary sensitivity analysis performed on the 2015 PLS using the new static characterization data for the RE-3 and RW-4 expansions, the chemistry and hydrology of the Ruth East and Ruth West pit lakes is not expected to change significantly as a result of the RE-3 and RW-4 expansions. The PLS and ERA were submitted to the Division in early 2017.

**Kimbley Pit:** Stabilization measures, implemented in the Kimbley Pit during Temporary Closure following characterization of pit lake waters and surrounding potential sources, were completed in 2002. Stabilization measures included backfilling of the ‘Kimbley Small Pond’ with neutralizing waste to remediate acidic solution and create an infiltration barrier; covering the sulfide berm with neutralizing waste rock; and regrading the surface to direct stormwater over carbonate bedrock prior to discharge into the Kimbley Pit Lake.

At the time of the 2005 PLS, the Kimbley Pit contained the Kimbley Main Pit Lake (approximately 1.2 acres) and the Kimbley Shallow Pond (approximately 0.5 acre), considered contiguous water bodies separated by a low permeability berm, which together comprised the 1.7 acre Kimbley Pit Lake with a 2005 surface elevation of 6,723.5 feet AMSL. Based on pit lake water chemistry collected through the second quarter 2005, the mean constituent concentrations in the pit water and the hydraulic gradient between the pit lake waters and groundwater suggest potential to degrade waters of the State, specifically groundwater, with Profile-I exceedances for TDS, magnesium, chloride, sulfate, thallium, and uranium. The 2005 PLS proposed evaluation for in-pit treatment or management through future mining of the Ruth Pit that could encompass the Kimbley Pit.

Kimbley Pit was dewatered concurrently with mining in 2009 and 2010. The MIW was conveyed by a dedicated 10-inch diameter HDPE MIW pipeline to a booster...
pump and on to the Mill through the existing Ruth MIW pipeline for use in the process circuit. Mining through 2010 lowered the pit floor and changed its shape. The resultant single pit lake exhibited much poorer water quality (pH 2-3 SU and elevated metals concentrations) than the Kimbley Pit Lakes prior to the 2009-2010 mining.

In August 2012, the Permittee proposed additional mining in Kimbley Pit, but in accordance with schedule of compliance items in the Permit, the Division required additional characterization and modeling to support revision and approval of the WRMP and the PLS and ERA prior to the resumption of mining. With approval of the Interim Mine Plan on 05 April 2013, the Division approved the resumption of mining in the Kimbley and Liberty Pits. This final mining in Kimbley Pit occurred in 2013-2014, after which the Kimbley Pit was partially backfilled with non-PAG waste rock starting in 2015. The Division required that the backfill include only non-PAG waste rock to 6,700 feet AMSL (above the predicted groundwater rebound elevation), above which PAG waste rock may be placed (and encapsulated within non-PAG waste rock) in accordance with the WRMP. As of April 2016, the Kimbley Pit had been backfilled above the 6,550-foot AMSL Ruth East saddle to 6,850-6,900 feet AMSL, with further backfill planned to 7,000 feet AMSL.

An EDC to install three new monitoring wells (W-26, W-27, and W-28) in the vicinity of the Kimbley and Wedge Pits was approved by the Division in March 2013. The new wells were required by the Division to provide more data on groundwater quality and static water levels for input into future revisions of the PLS. In September 2013, the Division approved a new proposed location for not-yet-installed monitoring well W-28, just east of the Jupiter WRD. In the same approval, the requirement to install well W-27 was retracted, due to a lack of a suitable location south of the Kimbley Pit that was not on a pit high wall, a haul road, an active WRD, or in a different hydrogeologic block than the pit lake. It took three attempts to install W-26, so the final monitoring well, installed in 2014, is labeled W-26RR. W-28 was dry, so it was plugged and abandoned, and replacement monitoring well W-28R was installed nearby in 2014.

The 2015 PLS includes two Kimbley Pit scenarios for comparative purposes: one with no backfill and the re-establishment of the Kimbley Pit Lake, and one with the approved non-PAG backfill above the predicted groundwater rebound elevation; the latter scenario reflects the actual case implemented at the site. For the hypothetical pit lake scenario, the 2015 PLS predicts the formation of a separate Kimbley Pit Lake as an evaporative sink for 22 years after the cessation of mining and dewatering. At 22 years the combined Ruth Pit Lake would begin overflowing into the hypothetical Kimbley Pit Lake, and the combined Ruth/Kimbley Pit Lake would reach its final stage of 6,633 feet AMSL (279 acres total, including a 41-acre Kimbley Pit lobe) 70 years after the cessation of mining and dewatering. The 2015 PLS predicts that prior to combining with the Ruth Pit Lake the hypothetical Kimbley Pit Lake water quality would exceed Division Profile III reference values.
for pH (2.9 SU), aluminum (82 mg/L), cadmium (0.12 mg/L), copper (15 mg/L), and fluoride (19 mg/L). The 2015 PLS predicts that after the hypothetical Kimbley Pit Lake combined with the Ruth Pit Lake, no further exceedances of Profile III reference values would occur. Wildlife toxicity data used in the 2015 ERA indicate that prior to combining with the Ruth Pit Lake, the hypothetical Kimbley Pit Lake water quality would present a moderate-high risk to terrestrial wildlife for aluminum.

In the actual scenario, in which the Kimbley Pit was backfilled in 2015 with non-PAG waste rock to at least 6,700 feet AMSL, the 2015 PLS predicts that groundwater will rebound within the non-PAG backfill to a final elevation of 6,633 feet AMSL (same as the predicted final stage of the combined Ruth Pit Lake) 32 years after the cessation of mining and dewatering. The groundwater gradient in the Kimbley backfill is predicted to be toward the combined Ruth Pit Lake; however, the predicted magnitude of groundwater discharge from the Kimbley backfill to the combined Ruth Pit Lake is very low at 2.8 gpm total. The 2015 PLS predicts that 10 years after the cessation of mining, the groundwater quality within the Kimbley backfill will exceed the Saxton Mineralized Hydrogeologic Block reference values for beryllium (0.007 mg/L), cadmium (0.094 mg/L), iron (244 mg/L), magnesium (155 mg/L), manganese (4.4 mg/L), sulfate (1,750 mg/L), TDS (3,410 mg/L), and zinc (9.8 mg/L); however, the 2015 PLS predicts that all of these groundwater exceedances will naturally decrease below reference values 50 years after mining ends, except for cadmium (0.010 mg/L) and manganese (1.4 mg/L). Despite these predicted exceedances of hydrogeologic block reference values, the predicted groundwater quality within the Kimbley backfill is significantly better than that of the actual groundwater detected in monitoring well AGT-9P within the Kimbley Pit. The groundwater at well AGT-9P was previously degraded, apparently as a result of historic acid leaching at the site prior to the current mining operation. Therefore, according to the 2015 PLS, the Kimbley backfill scenario will cause no further groundwater degradation, and will also eliminate the potential for adverse risk to terrestrial wildlife that an open Kimbley Pit Lake would present.

Wedge Pit: The Wedge Pit is located immediately northeast of the Kimbley Pit. The Permittee mined the Wedge Pit in 2009 and 2010, and backfilled the pit through 2015 with non-PAG waste rock above the predicted groundwater rebound elevation. A pit lake was never observed in the Wedge Pit, which is believed to be a result of groundwater drawdown related to on-going pumping at production well K-2P, located approximately 1 mile northwest of the Wedge Pit.

The 2015 PLS includes two Wedge Pit scenarios for comparative purposes: a hypothetical scenario with no backfill and the establishment of a Wedge Pit Lake, and the actual scenario implemented at the site with the approved non-PAG backfill above the predicted groundwater rebound elevation. For the hypothetical pit lake scenario, the 2015 PLS predicts the formation of a small (2 acre) Wedge Pit Lake which would reach a final stage of 6,566 feet AMSL 22 years after the cessation of
groundwater pumping at K-2P and the termination of dewatering of the South Hydrogeologic Block. The hypothetical Wedge Pit Lake water quality would meet all Profile III reference values except fluoride (2.65 mg/L). The 2015 ERA concludes that the pit lake water would not exceed species-specific toxicity criteria for any of the selected wildlife species.

The hypothetical Wedge Pit Lake would include a small groundwater discharge of 0.5-1.6 gpm to bedrock northeast of the Wedge Pit in the Robinson Canyon Hydrogeologic Block. The pit lake water is predicted to exceed Robinson Canyon Hydrogeologic Block reference values for sulfate (639 mg/L) and TDS (1075 mg/L), but meets all reference values for the adjacent Saxton Mineralized Hydrogeologic Block. However, nearby Robinson Canyon bedrock monitoring well R-H already exceeds Robinson Canyon hydrologic block reference values for manganese, sulfate, TDS, and other constituents, either due to natural conditions or historic mining impacts prior to the current Project; therefore, the hypothetical Wedge Pit Lake would not degrade groundwater further.

In the actual scenario, in which the Wedge Pit was backfilled with non-PAG waste rock as high as 6,850 feet AMSL in 2015, the 2015 PLS predicts that groundwater will rebound within the non-PAG backfill to a final elevation of 6,566 feet AMSL (same as the predicted final stage of the Wedge Pit Lake, because the groundwater inflow rate is predicted to be much greater than the evaporation rate from the pit lake), 18 years after the cessation of groundwater pumping at K-2P and the termination of dewatering of the South Hydrogeologic Block. The groundwater gradient in the Wedge Pit backfill is predicted to be to bedrock in the Robinson Canyon Hydrogeologic Block; however, the predicted magnitude of groundwater discharge is very low at 1.6 gpm total. The 2015 PLS predicts that the groundwater in the Wedge Pit backfill will not exceed Robinson Canyon Hydrogeologic Block reference values, except for manganese (1.0 mg/L). As stated above, nearby Robinson Canyon bedrock monitoring well R-H already exceeds Robinson Canyon Hydrologic Block reference values for manganese, sulfate, TDS, and other constituents, either due to natural conditions or historic mining impacts prior to the current Project; therefore, the Wedge Pit backfill is not expected to degrade groundwater further.

**Waste Rock Management Plan (WRMP):** At the Robinson Operation, ARD seeps and puddles have been documented associated with the historic ALDs, some of the historic pre-1990s WRDs, and with the late-1990s to current Liberty WRD. Localized groundwater degradation was documented in the vicinity of the Intera Drain prior to the construction of the current Liberty WRD. The purpose of the WRMP is to characterize the waste rock proposed for future mining and demonstrate no potential for degradation of waters of the State (either surface water or groundwater) if the proposed waste rock management and final permanent closure methods are used. The 26 October 2010 Intera CAP requires submittal of a revised and complete site-wide WRMP. The following revisions of the WRMP
have been submitted by RNMC and rejected by the Division because they provide insufficient information and fail to address previous Division concerns: 18 February 2010; 04 March 2010; 06 June 2011; 29 May 2012; and 30 January 2014. Some of the main Division concerns include, but are not limited to, over-reliance on characterization data from other pits and previously mined waste rock, over-averaging of characterization data, failure to demonstrate that the proposed management plan will not degrade waters of the State or cause acid seeps, and failure to provide critical data on source, character, and available volume of oxide waste rock to be used to cover the PAG waste rock.

The 2010 renewal of the Permit, effective 22 June 2011, included new schedule of compliance items that prohibit initiating mining or pit backfill activities not previously approved until a revised WRMP and a revised pit lake predictive model and ecological risk assessment are approved. New mining in Liberty Pit and Kimbley Pit was delayed due to this requirement, until an Interim Mine Plan was approved in April 2013. The Interim Mine Plan allows mining in the Liberty and Kimbley Pits until June 2014 (later extended to 31 August 2014, 28 February 2015, 15 July 2015, 31 December 2015, and 01 April 2016), in lieu of an approved WRMP and pit lake study, provided that a bond is posted for: 1) ten years of neutralization of acid pit lakes that may form, and 2) a cap consisting of synthetic liner overlain by a suitable thickness of growth media to cover all waste rock generated from the Liberty and Kimbley Pits. With Division approval of a revised pit lake study and ecological risk assessment on 17 February 2016, the Interim Mine Plan was terminated.

Revision 5.1 of the WRMP, dated 09 May 2014, adequately addresses many Division concerns, but still fails to address some major issues, such as providing containment for historic ALM that the Permittee has mined or plans to mine, and committing to more than 1-foot thickness of non-PAG cover on certain WRDs that exhibit a greater potential to degrade waters of the State. Therefore, Revision 5.1 was provisionally approved by the Division in June 2014 with additional requirements inserted into the Permit to address deficiencies in the WRMP.

Beginning with the June 2014 modification, the Permit requires that prior to mining historic ALM the Permittee must obtain Division approval of either a clear demonstration that the ALM does not have the potential to degrade waters of the State, or a TPPC (or FPPC, as appropriate), and appropriate reclamation bonding, to install a synthetically lined cap, or equivalent, over the material where it will be placed on the WRDs. The TPPC or FPPC must also include stabilization measures pursuant to NAC 445A.430 to inhibit meteoric water from migrating through any remaining material left in the mined ALD. The June 2014 Permit modification included a new schedule of compliance item requiring submittal of the first TPPC for mining ALM. Another schedule of compliance item was added at the same time requiring revision of a sampling plan proposed in the WRMP for additional characterization of ALM that the Permittee planned to mine for the purpose of
determining whether it has the potential to degrade waters of the State. The Permit was also modified in June 2014 to require mitigation for ARD accumulations within 90 days after discovery and associated quarterly reporting of mitigation actions performed. Permit monitoring requirements were modified to require an annual as-built drawing of end-of-year dump configurations, and an annual recalculation of the total site-wide tonnages of non-PAG material required and available for all uses specified in the WRMP, the Permit, and any other approvals. The annual recalculation must determine the required and available non-PAG tonnages both for the next calendar year and the remaining mine life according to the current mine plan. The Permittee must address any anticipated shortfalls of non-PAG material by identifying additional sources of non-PAG material as warranted and implementing a plan to representatively characterize the additional material to verify its adequacy. Finally, the Permit was modified in June 2014 to require, unless otherwise approved, a minimum 1-foot vertical thickness of non-PAG cover material on all final outer surfaces of WRDs, except a minimum 2-foot cover thickness is required on the Jupiter WRD and a synthetically-lined cap with minimum 3-foot cover is required on the Liberty/TS WRD.

An EDC was approved by the Division in April 2015 to revise the PAG/non-PAG cutoff for mined material, tailings, and other beneficiation waste material, from the standard value of 1.2 for the ratio of acid neutralization potential to acid generation potential (ANP/AGP), which is established in the Division guidance document, “Waste Rock, Overburden, and Ore Evaluation,” to a new value of 0.3 for ANP/AGP. The new 0.3 cutoff value is based on the results of 174 HCTs performed at the site from 1993 to 2014. The HCT data indicate overwhelmingly that mined material and tailings from the Robinson Operation that exhibit an ANP/AGP ratio greater than or equal to 0.3 do not generate acid. Two documented exceptions are a Tertiary rhyolite sample and a sample of efflorescent salts, both of which had unreliable ANP/AGP determinations due to a non-standard analytical method that may underestimate AGP, because it omits soluble sulfates that may be present in the sample. Aside from those two samples, all samples that generated acid exhibited ANP/AGP ratios less than 0.3. In this analysis, to be considered acid generating, a sample must have had at least two pH measurements below 5.5 during the HCT procedure.

However, not all samples that exhibit an ANP/AGP ratio less than 0.3 generated acid during the HCT procedure; in fact, less than 50% of HCTs with ANP/AGP less than 0.3 generated acid. With approval of the EDC, the Permit was modified such that future HCTs must be initiated only for materials that have ANP/AGP less than 0.3. However, several on-going HCTs on samples with ANP/AGP ratios between 0.3 and 1.2 will continue to run to provide long-term confirmation of the previous results. Approval of the new 0.3 cutoff authorizes the Permittee to manage all materials having ANP/AGP values greater than or equal to 0.3 as non-PAG, and only the materials having ANP/AGP values less than 0.3 as PAG. As a result, going forward, the tonnage of material on-site that must be managed as PAG will be
significantly less than with the previous cutoff value of 1.2, and a much greater tonnage of non-PAG material will be available for caps and covers. This change has repercussions for both the WRMP and the pit lake study; therefore, both documents were updated accordingly.

In August 2016, the Division provisionally approved an interim WRMP for expansions RE-3 and RW-4 of the Ruth East and Ruth West Pits, respectively. The interim WRMP includes representative static characterization of the 240 million tons of waste rock to be mined in the RE-3 and RW-4 expansions, but does not include new HCT data or revised hydrogeologic modeling, because of the short timeframe before commencement of the new pit expansion. In accordance with a new schedule of compliance item added to the Permit with the August 2016 Division approval, a full Revision 6 of the WRMP, including new HCT data and revised hydrogeologic modeling, shall be submitted by 31 March 2017. Based on the static characterization, the RE-2 and RW-4 expansions are expected to generate similar proportions of PAG waste rock to non-PAG waste rock as encountered in the previous phase of mining in the Ruth East and Ruth West Pits for the Pennsylvanian Ely Limestone (Pel), Cretaceous monzonite porphyry (Kmp), Mississippian Chainman Shale (Mc), and Tertiary rhyolite (Tr). A slightly greater proportion of PAG waste rock than encountered in the previous Ruth East and Ruth West mine phase is expected from the Permian Rib Hill Sandstone (Prh), silicification with pyrite alteration (SilPy), and Ely Limestone skarn alteration (Pel-Sk), which together account for a total of 34% of all waste rock (PAG and non-PAG) to be generated from the RE-3 and RW-4 expansions. PAG waste rock will continue to be encapsulated within non-PAG waste rock as per the previous WRMP. Spent ore mined from the A-Pad and the Mollie Gibson ALD as part of the Ruth West RW-4 expansion will be capped with a geomembrane liner and growth-media cover to achieve chemical stabilization in accordance with NAC 445A.430.

Petroleum-Contaminated Soil Temporary Storage Pad: An EDC was approved by the Division on 25 November 2008 for construction of a Petroleum-Contaminated Soil (PCS) Temporary Storage Pad (PCS Pad). The PCS Pad is located approximately 700 feet west of the truck shop, adjacent to the existing hazardous waste storage yard from which it is hydraulically isolated. The PCS Pad is used to store PCS material until it is shipped off-site for licensed disposal. Two PCS bioremediation facilities (one with three cells located east of the Liberty Pit and the other with one cell located west of the D-Pad leach facility) were permanently closed pursuant to an approved FPPC in 2010.

The PCS Pad consists of an 8-inch-thick concrete slab, with #4 steel reinforcement bars placed each way on 12 inch centers to form a horizontal grid, measuring 128 feet long by 110 feet wide. The subgrade for the concrete slab is a prepared 6-inch-thick aggregate layer compacted in excess of the calculated 95% maximum dry density as verified by five nuclear density tests. Containment capacity of
approximately 40,312 gallons, well in excess of 110% of the volume reporting to the PCS Pad from the 25-year/24-hour storm event (approximately 21,394 gallons), is provided by a 6- to 18-inch high concrete stemwall along the east side of the concrete slab and below the base of a 6-inch high concrete roll curb along the other three sides of the slab. Maximum PCS Pad containment volume, to the top of the 6-inch roll curb, is approximately 93,797 gallons. Waterstops were installed along all joints between the concrete slab and the adjacent stemwall and roll curbs. The base of the PCS Pad is sloped to the east, toward a 6-foot long by 3-foot wide by 3-foot deep solution collection and evacuation sump. Collected solution must be evacuated to approved containment. As of the 2017 Permit renewal, the Permittee is in receipt of Division comments on a submitted EDC for a PCS Management Plan.

C. Receiving Water Characteristics

The historic Robinson Mining District straddles a regional groundwater and surface water divide. North and east of the divide, groundwater and surface water flows are toward Robinson Canyon and past Ely into Steptoe Valley, which is a terminal basin with a playa. West and south of the divide, groundwater and surface flows are toward Giroux Wash and Jakes Wash, which are tributaries to the White River. The White River, in turn, is a tributary to the Colorado River.

Surface water drainages throughout the mine site are ephemeral, flowing only in response to major precipitation events. North and east of the regional surface water divide, unnamed tributaries within the mine site flow northeasterly towards Gleason Creek, which flows easterly through the town of Ely before turning northward into Steptoe Valley. West and south of the divide, surface drainage flows in a generally southerly direction through unnamed ephemeral tributaries into Giroux Wash and Jakes Wash. Ephemeral unnamed drainages located in the central portions of the Robinson Operation are located in closed basins. Runoff resulting from the 100-year/24-hour storm event is diverted around the regulated process components including the Mill and concentrator circuit, the gold heap leach facilities, and the Giroux Wash Tailings Impoundment.

All mined areas must meet the requirements of NAC 445A.429. That is, mined areas must not release contaminants that have a potential to degrade the waters of the State, and bodies of water that are a result of mine pits penetrating the water table must not create an impoundment which has the potential to degrade waters of the State or has the potential to affect adversely the health of human, terrestrial, or avian life.

Local groundwater flow at the Robinson Operation is complex and is controlled by a variety of structural and hydraulic attributes of the subsurface geologic formations. More than 68 drill holes, many of which were completed as monitoring wells, were originally used to characterize site groundwater conditions. As of the
2016 Permit renewal, groundwater data had been obtained from 240 wells at the site, although many of those had been abandoned or were not monitored for the Permit. Depth to groundwater varies throughout the site, ranging from 3 to 944 feet below ground surface, with depth varying principally by hydrogeologic block. Shallow groundwater is associated with discontinuous, perched alluvial aquifers. Most permanent aquifers throughout the site are located at depths in excess of 100 feet. Groundwater quality also varies, depending upon the hydrogeologic block.

Faulting in the mine area is significant, compartmentalizing the groundwater into at least 12 distinct hydrogeologic blocks. Most of these blocks have unique groundwater characteristics, such as hydraulic conductivity, water depth, and water quality. Detailed information is located in Division files and the Permit application materials.

Mine dewatering in the South Hydrogeologic Block has depressed the groundwater elevation in the town of Ely near Murry Springs. The Permittee has refurbished existing wells and drilled new wells to supplement the affected Ely drinking water requirements.

Extensive studies were commissioned by predecessor operators in 1997 and 1998 to characterize the chemistry, water quality, and geochemical evolution of site groundwater in each hydrogeologic block. The studies identified a representative baseline monitoring well in each hydrogeologic block that exhibits little or no anthropogenic impacts to groundwater quality based primarily on isotopic and trace element analyses. Water quality data from the baseline monitoring wells were used to establish the representative pre-anthropogenic background groundwater chemistry for each hydrogeologic block.

The following Table shows the pre-anthropogenic background groundwater concentrations in each hydrogeologic block that are naturally elevated above current Profile I-R reference values, as observed in the designated hydrogeologic block baseline monitoring wells. Background concentrations for all other Profile I-R parameters that are not listed in the Table are lower than the respective Profile I-R reference values. The background values listed in the Table represent mean concentrations (mg/L) in the baseline monitoring wells plus two standard deviations. These elevated background values are used together with the Profile I-R reference values for the other Profile I-R parameters to represent hydrogeologic block reference values. Any exceedances of hydrogeologic block reference values observed in groundwater wells that are caused by a mining operation represent groundwater degradation. The data and associated footnotes in the Table are taken from the Permittee’s 24 January 2008 response to Division comments on background groundwater quality.
### Hydrogeologic Block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Antimony (mg/L)</th>
<th>Arsenic (mg/L)</th>
<th>Cadmium (mg/L)</th>
<th>Iron (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saxton South</td>
<td>SKKR-13M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton North</td>
<td>SKKR-13M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>7.850&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton Mineralized</td>
<td>R-C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Canyon</td>
<td>K-2P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Valley</td>
<td>NRC-1P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth North</td>
<td>W-6B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>7.475&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth South</td>
<td>W-6B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>7.475&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mineralized</td>
<td>W-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>WCC-2MR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weary Flats</td>
<td>W-7</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp-Veteran</td>
<td>R-F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>2.023&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giroux Wash</td>
<td>WCC-G1R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hydrogeologic Block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Manganese (mg/L)</th>
<th>Nitrate + Nitrite as N (mg/L)</th>
<th>Sulfate (mg/L)</th>
<th>Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L)</th>
<th>Uranium (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saxton South</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton North</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton Mineralized</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>2163</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Canyon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>547.8</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Valley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth North</td>
<td>0.306&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>901.6</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth South</td>
<td>0.306&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>901.6</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Mineralized</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>709.3</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weary Flats</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1232&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>0.050&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp-Veteran</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>942.4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1653&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giroux Wash</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91.45&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a) Erratic rise in concentration beginning 2002 with unknown cause precludes establishment of a reliable background value at time of report;

b) Value may require recalculation in future due to long-term decreasing trend;

c) Long-term increasing trend apparently associated with a major water level drop in 1998 precludes establishment of a reliable background value at time of report;

d) This background value is accepted for the immediate vicinity of well WCC-G1R only. Other wells in the Giroux Wash Block are subject to Division Profile I-R reference values for all nitrogen-based parameters unless it is demonstrated that the background concentration typically exceeds a reference value;
e) Value is provisional due to the small number of data points.

The groundwater studies described above, combined with subsequent monitoring data, indicate that many monitoring wells at the site meet all hydrogeologic block reference values. Other monitoring wells, especially certain wells in the Saxton South Block, Saxton North Block, Ruth South Block, Weary Flats Block, and Tripp-Veteran Block, exhibit groundwater that exceeds some hydrogeologic block reference values, but the exceedances appear to be natural due to mineralization associated with the ore deposit. Still other wells exhibit groundwater that has been degraded above hydrogeologic block reference values as a result of mining operations, either the historic mining operations (e.g., MIWs and MIW sources in the Saxton Mineralized Block, Ruth Mineralized Block, Ruth North Block, and Robinson Canyon Block), or the current mining operation (e.g., Giroux Wash Block). The Permittee is actively mitigating historic and current groundwater degradation at the site in accordance with Division requirements.

The Permit requires monitoring of three weather stations at the Robinson Operation for various weather parameters that are necessary for calculations related to design, operation, and closure of components at the site. The three stations are the Giroux Wash Weather Station, Administration Area Weather Station, and Ruth Overlook Weather Station. An EDC was approved by the Division in April 2016 to relocate the Ruth Overlook Weather Station to accommodate future expansion of the Ruth West Pit. The new location is south of the Ruth West Pit, which is southeast of its previous location.

D. Procedures for Public Comment

The Notice of the Division’s intent to issue a Permit authorizing the facility to construct, operate, and close, subject to the conditions within the Permit, is being sent to the Ely Times for publication. The Notice is being mailed to interested persons on the Bureau of Mining Regulation and Reclamation mailing list. Anyone wishing to comment on the proposed Permit can do so in writing within a period of 30 days following the date of public notice. The comment period can be extended at the discretion of the Administrator. All written comments received during the comment period will be retained and considered in the final determination.

A public hearing on the proposed determination can be requested by the applicant, any affected State, any affected intrastate agency, or any interested agency, person or group of persons. The request must be filed within the comment period and must indicate the interest of the person filing the request and the reasons why a hearing is warranted.

Any public hearing determined by the Administrator to be held must be conducted in the geographical area of the proposed discharge or any other area the
Administrator determines to be appropriate. All public hearings must be conducted in accordance with NAC 445A.403 through NAC 445A.406.

E. **Proposed Determination**

The Division has made the tentative determination to issue the renewed and modified Permit.

F. **Proposed Limitations, Schedule of Compliance, Monitoring, Special Conditions**

See Section I of the Permit.

G. **Rationale for Permit Requirements**

The facility is located in an area where annual evaporation is greater than annual precipitation. Groundwater depth varies across the site, generally exceeding 100 feet in most locations, and there are several ephemeral creeks as well as perennial and ephemeral seeps and springs as shown in the Assessment of Area of Review of the application. Regardless, the facility must operate under a standard of performance that authorizes no discharge except for excess accumulations that are a result of a storm event in excess of the 25-year/24-hour storm event flow for which containment must be provided. The primary emphasis for identification of escaping process solutions shall be placed on aspects including routine inspection of facilities, proper construction and operation of the facilities, and monitoring, including respective leak detection systems, piezometers, and groundwater wells located throughout the facility. Required Giroux Wash Tailings Impoundment operations include subaerial deposition of tailings, to reduce permeability and enhance tails desiccation, and controls, such as monitoring the depth and the quality of solution in the supernatant pool and the BOC. Facilities shall be monitored in accordance with Permit conditions and current Operating Plans.

H. **Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

Under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 16 U.S. Code 701-718, it is unlawful to kill migratory birds without license or Permit, and no Permits are issued to take migratory birds using toxic ponds. The Federal list of migratory birds (50 Code of Federal Regulations 10, 15 April 1985) includes nearly every bird species found in the State of Nevada. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is authorized to enforce the prevention of migratory bird mortalities at ponds and tailings impoundments. Compliance with State Permits may not be adequate to ensure protection of migratory birds for compliance with provisions of Federal statutes to protect wildlife.
Open waters attract migratory waterfowl and other avian species. High mortality rates of birds have resulted from contact with toxic ponds at operations utilizing toxic substances. The Service is aware of two approaches that are available to prevent migratory bird mortality: 1) physical isolation of toxic water bodies through barriers (e.g. by covering with netting), and 2) chemical detoxification. These approaches may be facilitated by minimizing the extent of the toxic water. Methods which attempt to make uncovered ponds unattractive to wildlife are not always effective. Contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at 1340 Financial Boulevard, Suite 234, Reno, Nevada 89502-7147, (775) 861-6300, for additional information.

Prepared by: Matthew Schulenberg
Date: 30 October 2017

Revision 00: Permit Renewal; effective 18 November 2017: includes Minor Modification and Major Modification updates. Updates to A-Pad and Mollie Gibson material disposal and closures. Updates to B-pad temporary tank and description of approved B-pad E-cell design. Addition of WCC-G17 and WCC-G18 monitoring wells and aquifer testing.