MP00176

Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX

From: Rose, Nick EMPR:EX
Sent: December 15, 2006 10:02 AM
To: 'nrose@piteau.com'; Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX
Subject: FW: Inspection Report for August 30, 2006 Geotechnical Inspection

Attachments: Nick Rose.doc

Nick Rose.doc
(20 KB)

Chris,

FYI

Nick

-----Original Message-----
From: Tim Fisch [mailto:tfisch@mountpolley.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2006 1:05 PM
To: Rose, Nick EMPR:EX
Cc: Art Frye
Subject: RE: Inspection Report for August 30, 2006 Geotechnical Inspection

Nick : Please find attached additional response to questions posed arising from your Aug 30 getechnical report.
Regards
Tim Fisch
General Manager
Mount Polley Mining Corporation

-----Original Message-----
From: Rose, Nick EMPR:EX [mailto:Nick.Rose@gov.bc.ca]
Sent: 06 Nov, 06 10:00 AM
To: Tim Fisch
Cc: Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX; Milligan, Bruce EMPR:EX; nrose@piteau.com
Subject: RE: Inspection Report for August 30, 2006 Geotechnical Inspection

Tim,

Thank-you for the copy of your written response letter dated October 25, 2006 to my September 22, 2006 geotechnical inspection report.

For the East and West Wall instabilities in the Bell Pit, you indicated that the prisms and extensometers are being monitored daily and that daily velocities are calculated, plotted and compared to the average for each prism/extensometer. You then indicate that any readings greater than 150% of the average velocity for that prism/extensometer will be re-surveyed, replotted and if the reading is confirmed, the foreman will be notified to move the equipment away from the face until daily readings have returned to "normal" and the wall has been deemed safe.
Please provide further clarification of the threshold monitoring criteria that are being implemented for the East and West Wall prisms and wireline extensometers in the Bell Pit, as per the following
questions:

How are the "average" movement rates being calculated for each prism/extensometer (i.e., is the average a cumulative average or is it an incremental average over a certain number of days)?

What happens if accelerations are noticed in the data (i.e., do you still apply a threshold of 150% above the average velocity, if the velocity and average velocity are

increasing)?

Are threshold response criteria being implemented based on set threshold velocity values?

The other responses that you provided for the TSF, Bell Dump, Northeast Zone Dump and Wight Pit adequately answer the points identified in my September 22, 2006 inspection report. Please contact me by email or by phone at 604-986-8551 if you have any questions.

Regards,

Nick Rose, P.Eng.
Inspector of Mines, Geotechnical

-----Original Message-----
From: Tim Fisch [mailto:tfisch@mountpolley.com]
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2006 7:44 AM
To: Rose, Nick EMPR:EX
Cc: Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX; Milligan, Bruce EMPR:EX; nrose@piteau.com
Subject: RE: Inspection Report for August 30, 2006 Geotechnical Inspection

Nick : As indicated in our conversation November 3, please find attached a copy of the response forwarded to both Chris Carr and Bruce Milligan on October 6, 2006. Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.
Regards
Tim Fisch
General Manager
Mount Polley Mininf Corporation.

-----Original Message-----
From: Rose, Nick EMPR:EX [mailto:Nick.Rose@gov.bc.ca]
Sent: 03 Nov, 06 12:47 PM
To: Tim Fisch
Cc: Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX; Milligan, Bruce EMPR:EX; nrose@piteau.com
Subject: FW: Inspection Report for August 30, 2006 Geotechnical Inspection

Tim,

Written responses are required for my September 22, 2006 geotechnical inspection report for the August 30 inspection of the Mount Polley Mine.
I am forwarding the original email with attachments that was sent to you on September 22, 2006. I will call you to confirm that you have received this email.

Regards,

Nick Rose, P.Eng.
Inspector of Mines, Geotechnical

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Rose, Nick EMPR:EX
> Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 2:18 PM
> To: 'tfisch@mountpolley.com'
> Cc: Carr, Chris A EMPR:EX; Milligan, Bruce EMPR:EX;
'nrose@piteau.com'
> Subject: Inspection Report for August 30, 2006 Geotechnical
Inspection
>
> Tim:
>
> Please find the attached cover letter and inspection report for the
August 30, 2006 geotechnical inspection of the Mount Polley Mine. If you have any
questions, please contact me at 604-986-8551.
>
> Regards,
>

> Nick Rose
> Inspector of Mines, Geotechnical
>
> > <<13437_GEOTECH INSP COVER LETTER_INSP.pdf>> > >
> > <<13437_geotech_insp_report.pdf>>

November 23, 2006

Dear Nick Rose

This letter is in response to your request (dated November 6, 2006) for clarification of our handling of slope stability monitoring data.

All our survey data is entered in a spreadsheet that was supplied by Golder's Associates. Each reading consists of location as well as time and date. The following graphs are produced from the data:

- Relative movement VS Time
- Velocity VS Time
- Wander Plot of Prism

Following is descriptions of measures taken in the Bell Pit.

East Wall of the Bell Pit:

When monitoring started in late April, the slope was quite active and it was difficult to establish a baseline velocity. At that time, due to the active slope, all mining activity was diverted away from the wall and a catch berm was established. With time and movement, the wall has approached a more stable slope configuration and velocity vs time graph shows the velocity approaching zero. However, monitoring continues. From examining the data, it was determined that the average daily velocity of the active slope was 20mm/day. Therefore, when the velocity reached 30 mm/day, the prism was re-surveyed and if the reading was confirmed, the foreman was notified to move equipment and mining activity away from the wall until velocity decreased and the wall was deemed safe.

West Wall of the Bell Pit:

A crack on 1180 bench on the west side of the pit started opening up in early August 2006. Monitors and extensometers were installed to monitor movement. Monitoring continued until mid November when steps were started to mine the failed section of wall. During monitoring, survey data was entered into the Golders' spreadsheet. Initially, velocities were below 20 mm/day, but for cautionary reasons, the area in the pit below the slump was bermed off, restricting access. In the absence of background data, the same procedure used for the east wall was applied to the west side.

If you have any further questions or comments, please contact us.

Regards,

M. Dayle Rusk, Chief of Technical Services
Mount Polley Mining Corporation