

Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX

MP00148

From: Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX
Sent: July 26, 2006 2:19 PM
To: 'Nick D. Rose'
Subject: RE: Mt. Polley Permit Conditions for TSF Stage 5 Construction

Nick,

Thanks for the prompt review and for providing the permit conditions. I have forwarded the geotech conditions for permit preparation.

I have no problem permitting the tailings dam to ultimate height if all the information is provided. Any changes to the design, construction specifications or monitoring program would have to be submitted for permit amendment or simply to satisfy a permit condition (assuming, of course, that a suitable permit condition is included in the permit).

Chris.

From: Nick D. Rose [mailto:nrose@piteau.com]
Sent: July 26, 2006 11:44 AM
To: Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX
Subject: Mt. Polley Permit Conditions for TSF Stage 5 Construction

Chris:

Please find the attached draft permit conditions for the Mt. Polley TSF Stage 5 permit application for construction to the 951 m El. I have reviewed the Knight Piesold report and found the application to be straight forward, with two items identified, as listed below. I used the Stage 4 permit as a basis for the Stage 5 permit conditions. Conditions were added under Monitoring (a) and (c) to account for the following:

- No piezometer data was collected between September 22, 2005 and April 2006 due to a malfunctioning readout box cable and accidental destruction of piezometer cables during Stage 4 construction.
- Inclinometers installed through the lacustrine unit downstream of the Main Embankment were read in March 2006, October 2004 and the original baseline reading was taken in 2001. Slip indicator or "poor boy" surveys are currently taken during construction. As we discussed during my visit to Victoria earlier in the month, the inclinometers should be read with a standard inclinometer probe to be able to accurately assess potential for deflection of the inclinometer casing.

I received a call from Ron Martel yesterday. He was inquiring about the last year's permit application including a KP design report to the ultimate elevation of 965 m. My recollection of your and my discussions on that was that KP had not provided construction specifications to ultimate, only for Stage 4. If the KP report was worded such that the annual monitoring and construction specifications for each remaining stage are the same, and that any modifications to the design would be defined, could a permit to ultimate be developed with conditions stating that any changes to the design would have to be submitted for approval as an amendment to the permit?

Cheers,

Nick

Nick D. Rose, P.Eng.
Piteau Associates Engineering Ltd.
215-260 West Esplanade
North Vancouver, B.C.

26/07/2006

CANADA, V7M 3G7
Tel: (604) 986-8551
Fax: (604) 985-7286