

---

**From:** Marquis, Luke  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 02, 2014 11:44 AM  
**To:** Luke Moger  
**Cc:** Ostritchenko, Dmitri  
**Subject:** RE: Sieve Analysis of Boundary Zone Crush Plant

Hello Luke,

The material from the latest samples is consistent with the material that has been used in the past however the sand content remains lower than optimum. Because this material is being used specifically for filter placement would it be possible to increase the percentage of material between 3 mm and 0.4 mm by approximately 5%? Thanks,

Luke Marquis E.I.T  
Geotechnical Engineer  
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure  
3456 Opie Crescent  
Prince George, BC V2N 2P9  
Ph:250-564-3243 Cell: 250-640-3244 Fax:250-562-7045  
[luke.marquis@amec.com](mailto:luke.marquis@amec.com)  
[amec.com](http://amec.com)

----- Original message -----

**From:** Luke Moger  
**Date:** 07-01-2014 9:59 AM (GMT-08:00)  
**To:** "Ostritchenko, Dmitri"  
**Subject:** FW: Sieve Analysis of Boundary Zone Crush Plant

Hi Dmitri;

Can you please confirm that the last two samples completed (Boundary Zone reference in spreadsheet) are suitable for placement as Zone F (Filter) material please? We have started up the portable crusher on site and want to be able to confirm that the product is acceptable at the TSF (we are currently crushing the same spec material for the underground operation).

Kindest Regards,

**Luke Moger, PMP**  
Project Engineer, Mining Operations  
Mount Polley Mining Corporation

Tel: +1 (250) 790-2215 ext. 2113  
Fax: +1 (250) 790-2613  
Email: [LMoger@MountPolley.com](mailto:LMoger@MountPolley.com)

---

**From:** TSF Inspector  
**Sent:** June-30-14 11:51 AM  
**To:** Luke Moger; Ryan Brown  
**Subject:** Sieve Analysis of Boundary Zone Crush Plant

The boundary zone crush plant was finally up and running yesterday late morning. I took two samples at that time. I have attached the results (FS14-10 & FS14-11 are the two samples).

Looks like they did a good job of limiting anything above 1 inch. I did a visual inspection and didn't notice anything larger than that and they actually didn't have anything over  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch in either sample I processed,  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch was the top size.

Regards,

Davis