

May Day Mine Meeting Notes

Project Name: May Day - Idaho Mine Complex

Meeting Date: January 25, 2021 at 10:00 am

Meeting Participants:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>
Jack Nielsen	Sunrise
Barbara Nielsen	Sunrise
Sara Glinatsis	Sunrise
Jacob Dyste	CDPHE
Brenna Kampf	SGM
David Schiowitz	SGM

DRMS Recd: 9/5/2023

1. Status Update

- DRMS permit in temporary cessation
- Interim report due to CDPHE Enforcement by January 29th.
- Discharge permit submittal due by February 28th.

2. Discuss Hydrogeologic Data Review

- Jack requested summary report be sent to Lucas and Jacob (Brenna will send)
- David presented a summary of the area geology and report findings

3. Discuss Permitting Options

• DRMS

- Brenna gave a quick summary of DRMS permitting discussions with Lucas
 - Sunrise may be able to remove Idaho mill and mine from DRMS permit
 - Would require a statement from Wildcat that they do not want Idaho Mine and Mill sites reclaimed
 - Could be done as a technical revision
- Discussed right of access to Chief Portal on Wildcat property
 - Barbara indicated they have a license to enter that requires 2 years notice if it will be revoked
- Brenna shared that May Day was originally permitted as a 110, limited impact permit. The permit was converted to a 112, regular operations permit, when it was combined with the Idaho.
 - Need to follow-up with Lucas regarding which permit is appropriate and what would be required to change the permit.

• CDPHE

○ Stormwater Permit

- Discussed the need for a stormwater construction permit if no construction is occurring.
- Jacob indicated that a stormwater permit is not required if there is not any construction on-going

○ Discharge Permit

- Jacob indicated that the permit initially being discussed was an Individual Permit that would have included stormwater and discharge. If the Idaho Seep was not included in the CDPHE permit, Jacob thinks the mine could be permitted under the General Discharge Permit for metal mining activities, COR040000.
- Jacob indicated that CDPHE would rely on DRMS to assess the connection between the May Day and Idaho mines and that if DRMS was willing to remove the Idaho Seep from the May Day Mine permit, then CDPHE would be willing to do the same.
- Brenna indicated that depending on the level of documentation required from DRMS, SGM could take a look at the available water quality data to determine if the water outflow from the mines has different geologic characteristics.
- SGM did not feel a tracer study would be an effective method of showing a lack of connection between the two mines.

- Brenna indicated that removing the Idaho from the May Day DRMS Permit would not create two separate permits, but would leave the Idaho without permit coverage. Any mining activity would require a new permit application.
- Bond coverage for the May Day and Idaho was discussed. Sara indicated that there was separate bond coverage for the Idaho.
- Jacob questioned if the interim report due date should be extended to mid-February to allow for time to get input from Lucas on the DRMS permit.
 - Jack, Barbara, and Brenna agreed. Jacob indicated he would send an extension letter.

4. Follow-up

- Brenna will send the recorded Teams meeting and meeting notes to Lucas and everyone else.
- Brenna will send the SGM summary report to Jacob and Lucas.
- Barbara will share the License to Enter with Brenna.
- Sara will send the bonding information to Brenna.
- Jacob will issue an extension for the submittal of the interim report to mid-February.
- Once Lucas has had a chance to review the summary report and meeting notes, a conference call will be set-up between Lucas, Jacob, Jack, Barbara, Sara, David, and Brenna to discuss the DRMS permit.

Meeting Date: February 5, 2021 at 10:00 am

Meeting Participants:

Name:

Jack Nielsen
Barbara Nielsen
Sara Glinatsis
Lucas West
Brenna Kampf
David Schiowitz

Organization:

Sunrise
Sunrise
Sunrise
DRMS
SGM
SGM

1. Review of Hydrogeologic Summary Report

- Discussed the connection between the mines through the 545 Level, the depth of the 545 Level, and the overall direction of groundwater flow to the south.
- Lucas agreed that the report findings made sense.

2. DRMS Permit

- Discussed a 110 and 112 permit under DRMS.
 - i. Lucas indicated there was not a mechanism to convert from a 112 regular mining permit to a 110 limited operations permit once a permit had already been converted.
 - ii. Since the limit for a 110 permit is 9.9 total acres, the MayDay Mine may not fit in that classification anyways.
 - iii. The May Day Mine permit is currently includes approximately 45 acres of affected area and 274.7 total acres.
 - iv. The only real benefit of converting to a 110 permit would be reduced annual fees and technical revision fees.
 - v. Sunrise could reduce the acreage associated with the permit through an acreage reduction (a separate process from a technical revision).
- Discussed the designated mining operation designation (represented by the d in the permit number).
 - i. A designated mining operation (DMO) indicates an operation that has the potential to produce acidic mine drainage or is using hazardous chemicals. When the permit amendment was processed through DRMS, the operator intended to process ore and use chemicals at the site.
 - ii. When the permit amendment was processed in 2015, Sunrise submitted an acid-base accounting document and SPLP (synthetic precipitation leaching procedure) test results to

show that the May Day Mine is not a high sulfur mine and has a reduced potential for acid mine drainage.

- Discussed removing the Idaho Mine and mill site from the DRMS permit and the Idaho Seep from the monitoring program.
 - i. Lucas indicated a single technical revision (TR) could be submitted to remove the Idaho Mine and mill from the permit, remove the Idaho Seep and well from the monitoring program, and possibly remove the DMO designation from the permit. Lucas indicated he would follow-up to verify if the DMO designation could be removed using a technical revision.
 - ii. The TR would not require a public comment period. The cost to submit the TR would be \$1,006.
 - iii. To remove the seep from the monitoring program, Sunrise would need to submit documentation of the lack of connection between the two mines. The documentation could be a beefed-up version of the hydrogeological review memo prepared by SGM. We discussed additional water quality analysis of the water quality data that had already been collected to potentially show a different mineral composition between the two mines. Lucas was favorable of the additional supporting information.
 - iv. The acid-base accounting and SPLP test results would need to be submitted in support of removing the DMO designation from the permit.
 - v. To remove the Idaho Mine from the permit, a signed statement from Wildcat would be required to indicate that they are OK with leaving the buildings on the site and no additional reclamation is necessary.
 - 1. We discussed who would need to sign the release statement. Wildcat is the owner of the Idaho property, but several liens exist on the property.
 - 2. Sara requested that Lucas determine if a release statement signed by Wildcat is actually required.
 - 3. We also discussed reviewing the approved reclamation plan to determine what work was originally proposed on the site and if the removal of the buildings at the Idaho mill was proposed.
- 3. Discussed the monitoring program and stormwater plan.
 - Lucas indicated the current stormwater plan was approved by CDPHE, but verified by DRMS during site visits. He also said that any sampling requirements/limits would be issued by CDPHE, but enforced by DRMS.
 - The May Day monitoring program is a little different since it was established by DRMS in response to the violations at the site and in the absence of a CDPHE permit.
 - Barbara asked who would be responsible for maintenance of the BMPs on the Idaho property if the site was removed from the DRMS permit. We decided that would be a good question for Jacob.
- 4. Discussed the Chief Portal.
 - Jack asked if the Chief Portal was required as a secondary egress. Lucas indicated that it was not a DRMS requirement, but could likely be a requirement under MSHA. Sara indicated that she thought MSHA had told her since the ore was located right inside the May Day No. 1 adit, he didn't think the secondary egress was necessary.
 - We discussed whether the tunnel between the May Day No. 1 and Chief Portal was open. Jack indicated he believed it is, although no one has tested the ladders between the two levels due to safety concerns.
 - Brenna suggested that keeping or removing the Chief Portal was a decision between removing ties to the Idaho property and leaving portal open as an option for future owners of the mine to use as a secondary egress point if they increase the level of operations at the site.
 - Jacob indicated that if the Chief Portal was removed from the DRMS permit, then the portal would need to be closed and the site reclaimed.
- 5. Discussed the removal of equipment from the May Day No. 1 location.
 - Lucas indicated that DRMS would be open to Sunrise moving equipment off the May Day No. 1 site, but they would need a letter from the County indicating that there are no objections to the activity.

- Brenna indicated that there had been a code change and several changes in Planning Director's, so Sunrise would need to pose the question to the new environmental planning staff at the County, Chris Jones.
- Lucas indicated that a USACE permit may be required if they had to drive across the river instead of the bridge. Jack indicated he did not want to drive through the river and would try to avoid that plan.

6. Follow-up

- Lucas -
 - i. Determine if the permit status as a DMO can be changed through a technical revision.
 - ii. Determine if a signature from Wildcat (George) is required to release the reclamation requirements on the Idaho mill site.
- Sara - Find the acid-base accounting document and SPLP (synthetic precipitation leaching procedure) test results (they were an appendix to the 2015 DRMS amendment).
- Brenna/Sara - Review DRMS approved reclamation plan to determine proposed work at the Idaho mill site.
- Questions for Jacob -
 - i. Who will be responsible for maintaining the BMPs under the stormwater plan on the Idaho property if that site is removed from the DRMS permit? What needs to be done to reduce the scale of a stormwater permit?
 - ii. Who at CDPHE will decide if the Idaho Seep does not need to be included in the discharge permit? Since the NOV indicated the seep should be addressed, would enforcement make that call?