#870



CROWS NEST RESOURCES LTD.

TELKWA COAL PROJECT

GEOTECHNICAL, HYDROGEOLOGICAL & HYDROLOGICAL DESIGN REPORT

> SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WORK SYSTEMS APPROVAL

> > JANUARY 1985



PA 1692 OH

Γ

Ţ

To: All Inspector's of Mines and Resident Engineers Date: November 28, 1983

MEROBANDUM

Subject: Guidelines for Approval of Main Surface Haul Roads Regularly Used Sup File I. for the Transportation of Mineral or Waste at Mines

Energy, Mines and

Petroleum Resources

COLUMPIE

The following guidelines have been prepared in order to give Inspectors of Mines and companies operating or developing mines an indication of the type of main surface haul road which will require the approval of the Chief Inspector. Access roads, not used for main haulage, my beconsidered to be part of the general mine plan and do not require any specific approval of this sort.

Details shall be sent to the Chief Inspector and his approval shall be obtained before commencement of construction of any haul road regularly used for the transportation of mineral or waste and having one or more of the following features.

1. Fill

A haul road to be constructed with a maximum depth of fill in excess of 15 metres or a height in excess of 50 metres between crest and toe.

2. Cut Depth

A haul road to be established with a cut face exceeding 15 metres in height.

3. Avalanches and Landslides

A haul road which is located in the path of known avalanches or landslides.

4. Watercourse Crossings

A haul road crossing either a perpetual stream or any intermittent water course in which the maximum flow rate could exceed one cubic metre per second.

An application for the Chief Inspector's approval must include the following details:

- (a) Flans and sections showing topographical and stratigraphical details.
- (b) The cut and fill of the road, both in section and centreline profile.
- (c) Surface watercourses (including estimated flow rates).
- (d) Proposals for diversion ditches, drains, culverts, and bridges.
- (e) An engineering report on the stability of high cuts, deep fills, and steep cross slopes.
- (f) Means of protecting against avalanches and activated landslides.

le-C.Kobuison

W. C. Robinson, P.Eng., Chief Inspector of Mines

WCR:RTM:kw

Province of British Columbia Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources Parliament Buildings Victoria British Columbia V8V 1X4

Rm. 105 - 525 Superior Street, Victoria, B.C. V8V 1T7

*8>0

November 30, 1984

Mr. H. G. Rushton Vice-President Development c/o Crows Nest Resources P. O. Box 2699 - Station M Calgary, Alberta T2P 3Y9

Crowinese &

Dear Mr. Rushton:

Re: Telkwa Coal Project

As I had promised at the meeting convened yesterday to consider Telkwa, I am enclosing herewith one copy each of:

- "Guidelines for the Design, Construction, Operation, and Abandonment of Tailings Impoundments," issued by the Chief Inspector of Mines on December 30, 1983; and
- (2) "Guidelines for Approval of Main Surface Haul Roads Regularly Used for Transportation of Mineral or Waste", issued November 28, 1983, by the Chief Inspector of Mines.

These documents are commonly known as the Tailing's Guidelines and the Surface Haul Road Guidelines, respectively. They are now generally distributed to proponents within the guidelines approvals process, but you might not have received them for some reason. Enclosure (1) will assist you at both Stage II (See Section I.1.) and III, and enclousre (2) will be useful in your subsequent application for approval of the mine plan. I hope that you and your consultants will find these guidelines helpful, and if you have any questions on their interpretation you may contact me directly.

Thank you very much for arranging the meeting yesterday. I am sure that much good will come from it. I shall look forward to receiving the minutes from Malcolm Ross.

Yours very tru<u>l</u>

RTM:blh Enc1: (2)

R. T. Martin, P.Eng. ' Senior Geotechnical Inspector

cc: VT. Vaughan-Thomas, Inspector of Mines & Resident Engineer, Pr.George



#870

December 27, 1984

MEMORANDU

TO: Participants Mine Development Review Process

Re: Telkwa Coal Project

Attached please find the following documents:

Ministry of

Energy, Mines and

Petroleum Resources

- (i) letter, H.G. Rushton (Vice-President of Development, Crows Nest Resources Ltd.) to myself, 84-12-04;
- (ii) a three-page "Summary of Changes in Project from Stage I Submission"; and
- (iii) a map entitled "Mine Infrastructure Map".

The purpose of the documents is to update MDRP participants on some changes in project design since the Stage I report was reviewed.

If, after reviewing the update, you feel that it is necessary to revise your Stage II information requirements, please notify me of any changes as soon as possible. It is our understanding that the company will be visiting key MDRP contacts early in the New Year to obtain some feedback directly. The Stage II submission is currently scheduled for completion by March of 1985.

Yours truly,

Fargurond & luik

Raymond L. Crook Secretary Mine Development Steering Committee c/o Mineral Policy & Evaluation Branch

Attachments: see memo.

Distribution: see attached list

RLC:ljg

DISTRIBUTION LIST

All items, including map.

Alec Matheson J. Dick (6 copies) Cynthia Hawksworth Earle Warnock (4 copies) Jake McDonald (2 copies) Harvey Sasaki Roy Addison V. Dawson (4 copies for: J. Bones/W. Hubbard - R. Bone - M. Galbraith/B. Gordon Roger Norrish - T. Vaughan Thomas/D. Turner M. Kent - R. McGinn) Brian Apland T. Carter Paul Pallan F. Boyd (2 copies) M. Ito (2 copies)

Items (i) and (ii), but not map.

L.E. Sivertson Bruce Garrison J. Schuyff E. Pietrasek M. Sakamoto J. Bones/K. Koncohrada Frows Nest Resources

Eau Claire Place, 525 - 3rd Avenue S.W., Calgary, Alberta (403) 232-4355 P.O. Box 2699, Station M. Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M7 Telex 03-822505

December 4, 1984



Mr. R.L. Crook, Secretary Coal Guidelines Steering Committee Mineral Policy & Evaluation Branch Nineral Resources Division Ministry of Energy, Mines & Petroleum Resources Parliament Buildings Victoria, B.C. V8V 1X4

Dear Sir:

Subject: Telkwa Project

We are now at a point in design of this project that certain changes from our Stage I project size and in layout will be included in our Stage II submission.

In order that you and the other members of the Committee are aware of these changes, we have prepared the attached summary. Along with this summary, we are also including an up-to-date site plan. Needless to say, all of these items will be dealt with in greater detail in the actual Stage II submission, but we felt that this present material would provide a useful basis for ongoing discussions with the various agencies involved as preparation of Stage II continues.

Yours very truly

Al g. Mustale

H.G. Rushton Vice President - Development

Enclosures

TELKWA PROJECT

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN PROJECT FROM STAGE I SUBMISSION

1. Coal Markets

At the time that Stage I was submitted, it was still anticipated that market demand would be sufficient to absorb Telkwa coal in the latter half of the 1980's. During the first half of 1984, a review of likely demand and of available surplus supply, particularly in the Pacific Rim, indicated that prices for thermal coal were likely to remain depressed for the next several years. Accordingly, it was concluded that commitment of the Telkwa Project for construction was likely to be delayed until the later 1980's or early 1990's, despite the relative competitive advantages. However, the company has elected to proceed with submission of its Stage II approval, in order that the project will be in a position to proceed, when appropriate, in as rapid a time frame as possible.

2. Public Information Programs

The public contact and information programs continued throughout 1984. However, the open house scheduled for 1984 will be delayed into early 1985, prior to submission of the Stage II documents.

3. Project Schedule

It is now intended to submit Stage II near the end of the first quarter of 1985. While some permitting can be done following government approval, detailed design and project commitment timing are dependent on the market considerations set out in 1 above.

4. Contact Person

This should be amended to M.K. Ross, at the same address.

5. Geology

The 1984 drilling program was successful in locating additional reserves of coal in Seam #1 north of the East Goathorn pit.

6. Mining Locations

In essence, mining both east and west of Goathorn Creek will take place as in Stage I. However, mining will proceed in a total of six pits, three (1,2 and 3) located east of the creek, and three (4,5 and 6) located west of the creek.

Pit #3 will be mined continuously through the 20 year life of the project, initially in conjunction with Pits #1 and #2 and later in conjunction with Pits #4, #5 and #6. Consequently, there will be no need to cross Goathorn Creek at the initiation of the project. Pit #3 will be developed across its full width at its northern end and will advance in a southerly direction.

7. Mine Plan

Detailed review of the costs of mining the multi-seam, faulted Telkwa deposit indicated that coal which dips east and also thins down-dip adjacent to Pit #3 was not economic. The annual production has thus been finalized at 750,000 tonnes of clean coal. The overall strip ratio (bcm per tonne clean coal) is 8.2. This apparent large increase in ratio from the 5.6 figure given in Stage I is caused by more detailed mine design, pit ends and ramps, and better definition of plant recovery including dilution material.

8. Mining Method

There is no basic change in the proposed mining method. Loaders and trucks, with auxiliary equipment, will handle the overburden, and only minor blasting is anticipated. Pits will be backfilled as space becomes available.

9. Preparation Plant

The plant location indicated in Stage I has been changed. Two factors influenced this choice, namely the delineation of additional coal in Pits #1 and #2, north of the previously indicated mining area and difficulty in attaining suitable railway grades from the main line to the previous plant site.

Detailed work on bulk samples indicated several changes in the plant flow sheet from that outlined in Stage I. The coarse coal will be cleaned by a heavy media cyclone rather than a heavy media vessel, while fine coal cleaning will take place in water only cyclones without use of heavy media. All dewatering of product coal will be accomplished mechanically, and it has been confirmed that no thermal dryer will be required. The clean coal product will be stored in a silo while awaiting shipment. Refuse from the plant coarse circuit and from the thickener will be disposed of either in the external waste dumps or within pits as these are backfilled with overburden. While it had been hoped to use pressure filters to recover the remaining fine refuse in a semi-dry form, detailed work indicates that this equipment is not efficient on the materials encountered at Telkwa, and would result in excessive re-circulation of fine material back to the thickener. The end result would be that the circuit would need to be purged frequently to a tailings pond. Accordingly, the final design discharges the thickener underflow directly to a tailings pond, with appropriate flocculation treatment and recycling of properly clarified water to the plant.

10. Transportation

As noted in 9 above, the railway spur has been moved to the north side of the eastern transportation corridor to achieve acceptable grades. This route also minimizes potential conflicts with Hubert Creek and with moose habitat. Vehicle and personnel access will be from Coal Mine Road.

11. Utilities

The gas line to the plant site is 1 km now instead of the 4 km indicated in Stage I.

Water supply from wells is not feasible, following the detailed groundwater and geotechnical studies. All water will be obtained from an infiltration gallery adjacent to the Telkwa River and pumped to a storage tank at sufficient elevation to provide adequate service and fire protection pressures at the plant site.

Sewage treatment for both the construction camp and the plant site will be by means of a tile field. This will be installed in conjunction with the camp.

12. Land

Arrangements with all affected land owners are essentially complete, apart from small areas affected by the tailings pond, utility and railway easements, and necessary surface leases on unalienated Crown land. All facilities are located on coal licences held by the company. Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources



To: R. T. Martin, P. Eng. $\frac{14}{569}$ Senior Geotechnical Inspector 569

January 31, 1985

Re: Application Submitted by Crows Nest Resources Limited January 18, 1985 Requesting Approval of their Proposed Mining Work System Under Section 6 of the Mines Act

The attached report entitled "Crows Nest Resources Limited, Telkwa Project, Work Systems Approval, January 22, 1985" has been submitted for a Section 6 approval by the Chief Inspector.

Will you please review this insofar as your work is concerned and let me have your recommendations not later than March 15, 1985.

It may be a good idea to consult with Terry Vaughan-Thomas on this during your review as he will be preparing the final reply to Crows Nest.

Thum

Province of

British Columbia

V. E. Dawson, P. Eng. Deputy Chief Inspector of Mines

VED:1r

Attach.

cc: T. Vaughan-Thomas W. C. Robinson



.

.....

н

Province of British Columbia

Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources

MEMORANDUM

To: J. C. Errington, P. Ag. # 869anuary 31, 1985 Senior Reclamation Inspector

Re: Application Submitted by Crows Nest Resources Limited January 18, 1985 Requesting Approval of their Proposed Mining Work System Under Section 6 of the Mines Act

The attached report entitled "Crows Nest Resources Limited Telkwa Project, Work Systems Approval, January 22, 1985" has been submitted for a Section 6 approval by the Chief Inspector.

Will you please review this insofar as your work is concerned and let me have your recommendations not later than March 15, 1985.

It may be a good idea to consult with Terry Vaughan-Thomas on this during your review as he will be preparing the final reply to Crows Nest.

Han

V. E. Dawson, P. Eng. Deputy Chief Inspector of Mines

VED:lr

Attach.

cc: VI. Vaughan-Thomas W. C. Robinson

Province of British Columbia Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources

MEMORANDUM

- TO: T. Vaughan-Thomas, P. Eng. January 31, 1985 Inspector of Mines & Resident Engineer Prince George
- Re: Application Submitted by Crows Nest Resources Limited January 18, 1985 Requesting Approval of their Proposed Mining Work System Under Section 6 of the Mines Act

The attached report entitled "Crows Nest Resources Limited, Telkwa Project, Work Systems Approval, January 22, 1985" has been submitted for approval under Section 6 of the Mines Act by the Chief Inspector.

Will you please review this and let me have your recommendations by March 15, 1985.

Copies of the report have also been given to Terry Martin and John Errington for their review by this same date.

If you require any input or advice from any other specialist group, please contact the Section Head directly and a copy of the report will be made available to him.

Y & Dama

V. E. Dawson, P. Eng. Deputy Chief Inspector of Mines

VED:lr

Attach.

- cc: R. T. Martin R. Bone
 - J. C. Errington
 - W. C. Robinson

u			
•			
,			
;			1
D so a	2		
e 50 e			
1,18	nu mer	ilai ili ili ili ili ili ili ili ili ili	
Provide Provid			



Province of British Columbia

Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources

MEMORANDUM

To: V. E. Dawson, P.Eng. Deputy Chief Inspector of Mines Date: March 14, 1985

764

••••/2

File: Telkwa Projegt

Subject: Review of Submission for Approval (January 22, 1985)

In the letter from H. G. Rushton of Crows Nest Resources to you on January 18th, which had accompanied this application, a request was made for a Section 6 approval. I delayed my response to your request (January 31, 1985) for comments on the application because I had fully expected that the requested approval would either be withdrawn or be modified. As it stands, this is a seriously deficient application for that approval and must be rejected as such. However, it does appear to be a satisfactory conceptual presentation for a Stage II application for approval in principle under the Mine Development Review Process. Therefore, I am treating this as a review of concept only, and no recommendation for approval by the Chief Inspector is inferred at this time.

Even as a conceptual presentation very little information has been given on the tailings impoundment. If storage requirements are given, they are buried somewhere in the text. Likewise, the data on geology and hydrology are not readily located. I suggest that Crows Nest must revise its submission to recognize the requirements of Section I.1 in the Tailings Guidelines a copy of which had been forwarded to Calgary by me on November 30, 1984.

Although details of the haul roads to either the waste dumps or the plant site are not required at Stage II, they will be required in the ensuing approval stage--especially on the crossing of Goathorn Creek. Therefore, we should remind Crows Nest to be prepared to submit to the Chief Inspector the necessary information required by the Surface Haul Road Guidelines, a copy of which I had also sent to Calgary last year.

I have no comment on the pit designs.

The waste rock dumps and in-pit spoiling seem to be fairly straightforward. However, by the time that the approval stage is reached by this proponent we will probably be applying the new Dump Guidelines. Therefore, I suggest that we prepare Crows Nest for this possibility by requesting that they submit as much of the Preliminary Information as possible during Stage II on their dumping requirements. Accordingly, I have attached a copy of that portion of those proposed guidelines.

#370

Memo	to:		- 2 -	March 14, 1985
V. E.	Dawson,	P.Eng.		

The one aspect of the submission that I would question is the disposal of the coarse refuse. It is not clear how it could be incorporated into the waste rock dumps. Although it is likely to be less than one per cent of the waste dumps on the average, it is possible that it could be concentrated in critical locations. I wonder whether this is a practical means of disposal either in terms of conservation of the refuse for future use or in terms of safety in the operation of a dump which might be smoldering. Will the coarse refuse be dumped into the abandoned pits in later years? Would it not be better to pile it closer to the plant? I feel that a number of questions about coarse refuse are left begging in this submission.

Notwithstanding the preceding criticisms, I believe that this submission will form a successful Stage II presentation. It is clear that more detailed design studies are already in progress and, I trust, will be completed in time for a more detailed application for the approval by the Chief Inspector under Section 6 of the Mines Act.

Janua Martez

RTM:blh Encl:

R. T. Martin, P.Eng. Senior Geotechncial Inspector

cc: VT. Vaughan-Thomas, Inspector of Mines & Resident Engineer, Pr. George

GUIDELINES FOR MINE DUMPS

T. V-7

Waste Dumps are an integral part of a mine. Therefore, they must receive the approval of the Chief Inspector of Mines under Section 6 of the Mines Act. In certain underground mines, in which the waste rock is primarily used as backfill, and for some strip mines, in which the waste rock is replaced in the excavation after the extraction of the desired mineral, the dumps outside the mine itself tend to be rather small and can be approved without special consideration as a part of the general mine plan. However, large metal mines and most coal mines tend to generate major waste dumps outside the pit area. These might be waste rock dumps, overburden stockpiles, low grade stockpiles, spoil piles, or any other tipped material which could constitute a potential hazard to either the public or the workers—in addition to having a potentially significant impact upon the environment. As a result, these major waste dumps will normally be subjected to a geotechnical assessment before receiving the written approval of the Chief Inspector of Mines.

•

These guidelines outline the information that is usually required for the geotechnical assessment. They will also serve as a guide to be used during the final, or licensing, stage of the approval process as to what criteria differentiate minor and major dumps. If the proponent is in doubt about the status of his dumps, he should submit the preliminary information that is required on all dumps in order for the Chief Inspector to make an appraisal of their potential for hazard. Where a potential for hazard is perceived, a request will be made for the additional, detailed information which is usually required only for major dumps. However, some time can be saved by proponents with major waste dumps if they retain a professional geotechnical engineer at the outset to analyse the dumps and make appropriate recommendations in a report which can be presented in support of the application for the approval of the Chief Inspector.

Features of Major Dumps

A major dump generally has some of the following features:

- i. a total volume exceeding one million cubic metres,
- ii. a height after resloping for reclamation exceeding fifty (50) metres,
- iii. a total area exceeding one hectare,
- iv. a location on natural slopes which are often steeper than twenty degrees (20°) from the horizontal plane,
- v. filling, or interfering with, a stream (or collection of streams) having a potential peak flow greater than one cubic metre per second $(1 \text{ m}^3/\text{s})$ and,
- vi. situated above and close to buildings, roads, domiciles, important power lines or pipelines, and major rivers or streams.

In addition to the foregoing features defining major dumps, any minor dump which has been identified either as subject to spontaneous combustion or as a potential source of acid leachate, or some other contaminant, may be treated as a major dump at the discretion of the Chief Inspector.

Preliminary Information

-

7.1

-

When submitting an application to the Chief Inspector for approval of the mine plan—or alternatively for approval of any dump that is a substantial modification of a mine plan—the following preliminary information should be included.

- 1. A Plan showing:
 - (a) the proposed dumping location(s),
 - (b) other relevant mine features,
 - (c) vegetation in the area,
 - (d) the lease, or licence, boundaries,
 - (e) existing, and proposed, drainage patterns,
 - (f) locations of buildings, settlements, roads, streams, power and other lines,
 - (g) locations of exploratory pits, trenches, or boreholes, and
 - (h) any alternative locations that are being considered.
- 2. A Statement on the Dump Size giving:
 - (a) volume and area required,
 - (b) type of waste and sorting, if any, and
 - (c) heights and depths of the dump at crucial points.

3. An Appraisal of Mineralization in the area including:

- (a) logs of deep boreholes and exploratory excavations,
- (b) appropriate geological sections, and
- (c) a statement on the viability of any observed enrichment beneath the proposed dumps.
- 4. A System of Dump Development with:
 - (a) method of placing (tipped, dumped, or spread),
 - (b) lift or layer thicknesses,
 - (c) specified compaction or zoning,
 - (d) stages of development, when appropriate, and
 - (e) final condition after resloping and reshaping in preparation for the rehabilitation and revegetation in accordance with the Mine Reclamation Guidelines.
 - 5. Other relevant details such as:
 - (a) foundation preparation,
 - (b) runoff and drainage management,
 - (c) snow removal, and
 - (d) relevant operational procedures.



KLOHN LEONOFF

OUR FILE: PA 1692.0H

January 18, 1985

Crows Nest Resources Ltd. Eau Claire Place 525 - 3rd Avenue S.W. Calgary, Alberta T2P 0G4

Mr. H.G. Rushton Vice President Development

Telkwa Coal Project Work Systems Approval

Dear Mr. Rushton:

We are pleased to submit 6 copies of the geotechnical, hydrological and hydrogeological appendix for the 'Work Systems Approval' for the Telkwa Coal Project.

The document comprises the following items:

- i) Executive Summary
- ii) Recommendations
- iii) Drawing D-0124 Layout of Drainage System
- iv) Drawing D-0125 Diversion Ditches & Spillway Channels, Sections and Details
- v) Drawing B-0135 High Wall Stability General Case

Yours very truly,

KLOHN LEONOFF LTD.

THOMAS G. HARPER, P.Eng. Manager, Mining Services

TGH/sh Enclosures

TELKWA COAL PROJECT

Geotechnical, Hydrogeological & Hydrological Design Report

Summary & Recommendations For Work Systems Approval

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The terms of reference for this assignment were to provide geotechnical, nydrogeological and hydrological consulting services and conceptual designs in support of a Stage II Permit Application for the Telkwa Coal Project.

The Assignment included the following:

- Review of geological, hydrological and hydrogeological data;
- . supervision of drilling of 2 test holes;
- packer permeability testing and installation of piezometers;
- . groundwater investigations;
- . pit slope stability;
- . waste dump design;
- . design of tailings pond;
- . design of drainage ditches and settling ponds;
- . design of groundwater control measures;
- . presentation of designs and recommendations.

Results of the data review and field investigations show that the property comprises variable thicknesses of glacial till and gravel, overlying a sequence of sandstones, siltstones, mudstones and coal. The bedrock materials range from strong to very weak rocks. The mudstones are low to medium plastic.

The bedrock dips at $15^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ to the east and is structurally dominated by a number of north-south trending reverse faults and normal faults which trend north-south and east-west.

The bedrock is generally of low permeability and contains no stratigraphically definable aquifers. The groundwater table is at or close to ground surface over much of the eastern part of the project site. Open or breccia filled fault zones are expected to be the major conductors of groundwater.

(i)

The designs presented are as follows:

Pit Slopes

Pit Slopes have only been considered for #3 Pit. The highwall is located on the east side of the pit and will trend north-south. Conditions for highwall stability are favourable as the major structural discontinuities, the north-south trending faults and the bedding planes both dip east. Highwall slopes up to 100 m high may be cut at an overall 60° angle. Locally, secondary faults may require flatter high wall angles over short sections.

Horizontal drains will be required to reduce groundwater pressures where the highwall is more than 50 m high.

The footwall will be parallel to the bedding planes and will dip at 20° to the east. To prevent instability, no undercutting of the footwall strata should occur. Pressure relief wells will be required in the footwall to reduce the risk of floor heave.

Overburden slopes in glacial till may be cut at 2H:1V.

Waste dumps will be constructed in out-of-pit and in-pit locations. Out of pit dumps may be constructed with overall 2H:IV slopes. The dumps should be constructed in lifts and benched to suit operating conditions. Foundations should be stripped of topsoil and overwet materials. Uphill construction is recommended to minimize overburden stripping. Deleterious and sulphur rich materials may be placed in isolated cells within dumps to minimize the potential for acid drainage. These materials should be compacted in 1 m lifts.

In-pit dumps in #3 Pit should be constructed with north-south trending slopes dipping into the footwall at 1.6H:lV and east-west trending slopes at 2.25H:lV. All wetted and loose material should be removed from the foundation area before construction.

Pit Dewatering

Groundwater inflows into the pits will be small with normal flows of m²/hour 50 approximately beina expected. Short duration exceptional flows when fault zones are intersected may effectively double the inflow rate. Infiltration should be controlled by means of ditches and sumps. Pumping capacity requirements will be dictated by inflows from direct precipitation. Average pumping requirements will range from 95 m^3/hr in year 1 to a maximum of 126 m^3/hr in vears 19 and 20. Emergency pumping capacity will be required to handle major precipitation events. Water from the pit will be pumped to drainage ditches and passed through settlement ponds prior to discharge.

Surface Water Management

Head water diversions will divert all uncontaminated surface runoff from the upstream side of the mine area. The diversions are designed in accordance with the Ministry of Environment Regulations.

Interceptor ditches will minimize the contamination of surface water in the mine area and prevent release of untreated water to natural water courses. All contaminated water will be held in settlement ponds with sufficient detention time for suspended matter to be removed. Discharge points will be monitored to ensure that clarified water meets water quality standards.

Tailings Pond

Fine tailings from the wash plant will be stored in a tailings pond. Clarified water will be recycled to the plant as make-up water.

The dam will be constructed by the downstream method and will have an ultimate height of 18 m. The dam will have 2.5H:1V slopes downstream and 2H:1V upstream with crest width of 4 m.

Vehicle

(iii)

A 6 m high starter dam will be constructed of glacial till. This material will be continued up the upstream face of the main dam to provide an impervious facing to control seepage. The downstream section of the main dam will be constructed of select pit waste.

Tailings will be spigotted from the uphill end of the pond and clarified water will be reclaimed by a barge mounted pump.

Seepage through the pond floor will be minimized by the use of filters and wells will be installed to monitor seepage from the pond.

(iv)

1.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The designs presented in this report are appropriate to the present stage of the project. Further work will be required during the detailed design phase of the project and some additional data collection will be required to confirm assumptions made during the Stage II conceptual design.

1.1 Hydrology

The level of data available is adequate for detailed design with the exception of monitoring data for Hubert Creek. A considerable proportion of the project site lies within the Hubert Creek catchment. We recommend that concurrent precipitation and continuous stream flow monitoring be carried out for a minimum period of l year. The data will be used to determine the surface run off potential of the site and may result in more economic designs for the drainage system and settling ponds.

All existing stream gauging and climate monitoring should be continued.

1.2 Waste Dumps

The conceptual design for the proposed out-of-pit waste dumps are based on <u>assumed foundation conditions</u>. During the detailed design phase of the project site investigations should be carried out at the two out-of-pit waste dump sites <u>to determine foundation conditions</u>. The conceptual waste dump designs will be confirmed or modified as appropriate and the amount of overburden stripping determined.

1.3 Tailings Pond

Fine tailings from the wash plant will be stored in a tailings pond adjacent to the wash plant. The conceptual designs are based on assumed foundation conditions. The site is underlain by thick terrace gravel deposits which comprise the surficial aquifer from which local residents obtain domestic water. PA 1692.0H

Investigations should be carried out during the detailed design phase of the project to determine foundation conditions in order to confirm the conceptual tailings dam design.

In addition, design of a filter system will be required to control seepage from the pond and to prevent migration of fines into the aquifer.

1.4 Groundwater

The groundwater monitoring currently in progress should be continued. Water quality sampling and testing programs should also be continued. Field pH measurements should be made on all water samples collected.

1.5 Plantsite and Rail Spur Foundations

Site investigations will be required at the detailed design stage to determine foundations conditions for the plant site and rail spur.

1.6 Make Up Water Intake

Site investigations will be required at the detailed design stage to determine design parameters for an infiltration gallery or well type make up water intake.

1.7 Haul Road Crossing for Goathorn Creek

Site investigations and hydraulic design will be required at the detailed design stage to provide a haul road crossing for Goathorn Creek which complies with all applicable regulations.









6 SURFACE OF IN-PIT WASTE DUMP IN MINED OUT AREA 7 -EXIST. GROUND \$ ROAD PIT WALL DURING MINING Tell Res San SEE NOTE 3 ----DYKES TO CONTAIN SLURRY IN CASE OF PIPE BREAK #870 EXIST. GROUND NOTES 1. SECTION A 15 TYPICAL OF : - INTERCEPTOR DITCH NO. I FROM OUTLET TO POINT OF ENTRY INTO PIT NO.3. - INTERCEPTOR DITCHES NO. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 \$ 10. - HEADWATER DIVERSION NO. 1, STA. 3+000 - 5+ 850. - OUTLET DITCH FOR EMERGENCY SPILLWAY OF TAILINGS POND. 2. SECTION B IS TYPICAL OF - HEADWATER DIVERSION NO. 1, STA. 0+000 - 3+000. - SPILLWAY CHANNELS FOR SETTLING PONDS NO. 1 42. 3. SECTION C IS TYPICAL OF INTERCEPTOR DITCH NO. 1 WITHIN LIMITS OF PIT NO. 3. 4. POADSIDE DITCHES TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN GOATHORN CREEK VALLEY AS SHOWN IN SECTION D. 5. MINIMUM DEPTHS OF HEADWATER DIVERSION ¢ INTERCEPTOR DITCHES ARE AS FOLLOWS CHANNEL STATION 0' 0+000 - 4+400 1.0m. HEADWATER DIVERSION NO. 1 . " 1 4+400 - END 0.6m. 11 FULL LENGTH 11 "2 0.6m. FULL LENGTH INTERCEPTOR DITCHES NO. 1-8 0.G.m. FULL LENGTH " "9€10 0.8m. SPILLWAY CHANNEL NO. 1 FULL LENGTH 1.0 m PRELIMINARY TO BE READ WITH KLOHN LEONOFF REPORT DATED_ REVISION DETAILS REV. DATE DESIGN DRAWN L.F.S. Chick DEC. 84 N.T.S. PROJECT TELKWA COAL PROJECT **KLOHN LEONOFF LTD.** DIVERSIONS, DITCHES & SPILLWAY CHANNELS SECTIONS & DETAILS CONSULTING ENGINEERS DATE OF IBSUE PROJECT NO. DWG. NO. 18-01-85 PAIG92 D-0125 CROWS NEST RESOURCES LTD. 0



.

-

Coordinates are on U.T.M. GRID (ZONE 9) and are derived from Government control stations BLITZEN, PADRE, TACK, AMIGO, BULKLEY, CREEK, MUCHO, PABLO,

DRAWN BY: RGP

LEGEND

U.T.M. ZONE 9

AUTHOR: W-C	SCALE: 1:5 000	ENCLOSURE No :
E	AST WASTE END OF YEAF	DUMP R 20
	WEST CENTRAL B SMITHERS AREA	.C.
	Crows Nest Resour	r ces Limited 0 N
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TO 6 Value	a fillio anteniori

LEGEND

AUTHOR: MONGARD,W-C	SCALE: 1:5000	ENCLOSURE No :
DATE: 84-12	REVISED:	

MAP INDEX

LEGEND

93L

X		#870	
Cre	ows Nest Resourc E X P L O R A T I O	es Limited N	
	WEST CENTRAL B.C. SMITHERS AREA		
	SITE PLAN		
AUTHOR: MONGARD,W-C	SCALE: 1:5 000	ENCLOSURE No :	
DATE: 84-12	BEVISED:		

그렇는 것 같아. 아무렇게 생활했는 것

.

.

6 046 000 mN

6 044 500 mN