

RECEIVED

AUG 15 2012

Durango Field Office  
Division of Reclamation,  
Mining and Safety

Artichoker's comments on May 4, 2012 version of the Drainage Study

#### Section II

- The study was revised to reflect accurate post-borrow topography; however the basin area numbers in the report have not changed.

#### Section III

- The report says there are seven sub-basins, but the drawings show eight. The new #8 basin is not described in the report, nor is the "Disturbed" Basin. The "Disturbed" basin was not included in the drainage study, but should be.
- The report, appendices, and drawings all have conflicting information regarding basins, tributary areas, etc.

#### Section IV

- The new basin #8 should have a culvert associated with the drainage crossing, but there does not appear to be one considered.
- The report and appendices have conflicting information regarding capacities, flows, etc.

#### Section V

- The report says that all mined area drainage will be channeled to a zero discharge pond. I don't understand the concept of a "zero discharge retention pond" with a swale and weir exiting the pond, to Basin Creek.
- Unwatering the hypothetical full retention pond at 30,000 gallons/day will take 120 days. This is unreasonable.
- The report refers to the "engineering plans" construction design and details, regarding the retention pond. I cannot locate any details on this pond.

In a nutshell, we should still be concerned about the location and lack of information regarding the pond. I don't think they will be able to dig much of a depression where they identify it, since we already mined all of the material out of there. That means they need dikes, or dams, which will then be incompatible with their discharge swale....which shouldn't be there anyway. Envision a 1 acre pond, twelve feet deep.