

# Review of Baseline Geochemistry Report

## *Grassy Mountain Project*

**David Livermore**

**Andrew Nicholson**

**Jarrold Gasper**

January 14, 2020

Presentation to the TRT Subcommittee



## **Baseline Geochemical Characterization Report**

**Grassy Mountain Project**

**Report Prepared for**

**Calico Resources USA Corporation**



**Report Prepared by**

 **srk** consulting

SRK Consulting (U.S.), Inc.  
SRK Project Number 506800.02  
January 2018 (revised April 2018, October 2019)

# Overview

- Background
- Results of review
  - Review categories
  - Identified issues
  - Proposed resolutions
- Summary

## Environmental Baseline Study Work Plans

Grassy Mountain Project



**September 22, 2017**

Prepared by  
EM Strategies, Inc.  
1650 Meadow Wood Lane  
Reno, Nevada 89502  
775-826-8822

# Background

- ◆ Integral reviewed previous report in 2018
  - Identified a number of data gaps
  - Calico/SRK:
    - Committed to filling data gaps
    - Responded to comments and requested edits
- ◆ Integral provided initial review to DOGAMI in early January 2020

# Review Categories

## Category 1: Work Plan Performance

- Did report conform to Baseline Study Work Plans?
- Did report satisfy OAR 632-037 and 340-043?

## Category 2: Documentation Completeness

- Is the documentation of the geochemistry work complete?
- Can the reviewer verify the accuracy of the information, analyses, or conclusions?
- Is the document free of substantive errors and contradictory statements?

---

# Review Categories

## ◆ Category 3: Draft Permit Considerations

- Non-critical—intended to support TRT in permitting
- Identifies issues that will have to be addressed as part of the permit after the consolidated permit application
- Issues may include requirements for testing, monitoring, or documentation during mine development and/or operation

## ◆ Category 4: Best Practices

- Substantive and non-substantive errors/typos in the document
- Does the electronic format conform to required federal standards? Is the document presentation clear and transparent?

---

# Category 1—Work Plan Performance

- ◆ No Category 1 issues found
- ◆ Contingent on addressing some Category 2 issues

# Category 2—Documentation Completeness

## ⬢ Borrow/Road Cut Samples

- No map, limited sample information, no sample selection rationale
  - Resolution: provide additional information

## ⬢ Cemented Rock Fill

- Contradictory statements regarding placement
  - Resolution: resolve contradictions

## ⬢ Incomplete Description of Analyses

- For example, “statistical analysis of the multi-element data...” but not described or referenced
  - Resolution: provide documentation of analyses

# Category 3—Draft Permit Considerations

## ◆ Data Gaps and Remaining Tasks

- Report identifies handful of “to-do” items
  - Resolution: provide summary of outstanding tasks in document summary

## ◆ Amendment of Tailings

- Tailings amendment evaluation done per regulation
- Excess of lime results in high pH (~12)
  - Resolution: provide additional discussion of high pH, identify further characterization as part of tailings management plan

---

# Category 4—Best Practices

## ⬢ Constituents of Concern

- Put data/understanding to use and identify potential concerns
  - Resolution: provide list of COCs, description of selection criteria

## ⬢ Typos and Errors

- Many typos, figure/table reference issues, other reference issues in the document
  - Resolution: proofread document prior to resubmittal

## ⬢ General Document Usability

- Challenging to navigate 2,000 page PDF file
  - Resolution: bookmark PDF, suggest Section 508 compliance as benchmark

---

# Summary

- Report appears to meet requirements of work plan
- Additional documentation and reporting necessary to confirm

---

# Questions?