



Douglas A. Ducey
Governor

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



Misael Cabrera
Director

Water Quality Follow-Up Inspection Report

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Facility Name: Trench Camp/Norton/January Mine Adit | Complaint No: 14363 | |
| Physical Location: Harshaw, AZ | Inspection No.: 295680 | |
| County: Santa Cruz | Arrival Date and Time: 1/23/2018 2:30 PM | |
| Mailing Address: 2210 E. Fort Lowell Rd. City, State, Zip: Tucson, AZ 85719 | Inspector(s): Jerry Helton | |
| Coordinates (for new locations): Latitude: Deg.: 31 Min.: 28 Sec.: 19.0 Longitude: Deg.: 110 Min.: 45 Sec.: 49.0 | Inspector Phone: (520) 628-6718 Inspector Email: jrh@azdeq.gov | |
| Owner/Responsible Party: Arizona Minerals Inc. | Was Inspection Announced? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Onsite Contact Person(s)/Facility Operator(s): Sarah Richman Preston Wheeler | Weather: Sunny/Clear | |
| Nearest Receiving Water, if applicable (indicate distance): Alum Gulch Creek | | |
| Inspection Report Issued: Via email from ADEQ office | Facility Initial: | ADEQ Initial: |
| Results of Inspection: <input type="checkbox"/> No deficiencies were noted during the course of the inspection. No ADEQ action will result from this inspection. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potential deficiencies were noted during the course of the inspection. Additional correspondence regarding this inspection may be forthcoming. | | |
| Comments: The facility agreed to work on the issues identified and to respond to the inspector with supporting documentation. | | |
| PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN DURING INSPECTIONS ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Description of the Complaint</p> | <p>Summation: Mine reclamation project does not have an NOI and is impacting Harshaw Creek and into Humboldt Canyon, and Alum Gulch.</p> |
| <p>Observations:</p> | <p>Prior to departing for the site inspection, the inspector reviewed the SWPPP submitted and on-file with ADEQ, specifically the Site Map and SWPPP Section 5 for identified structural control measures. The site map did not contain the information required by the permit; specifically no structural control measures were identified and no outfalls were identified. The SWPPP section 5 did not identify any structural control measures.</p> <p>The inspection was not a comprehensive inspection rather a complaint inspection for items related to the complaint.</p> <p>On-site the inspector met with Sarah Richman and Preston Wheeler. Due to time constraints the Notice of Inspection Rights were read to the on-site representatives while traveling to the specific area in question.</p> <p>The area of concern is at the lowest area of the mine near the January Adit. Once there, the inspector observed waste rock piles, haul roads, and other miscellaneous earth moving activity. The tailings are not directly involved in this area being separated by structural controls.</p> <p>The waste rock piles, haul roads, earth moving activities, and multiple water sheds converge to this location prior to discharging off-site into Alum Gulch Creek.</p> <p>Although a discharge was not observed at the time of inspection, it was agreed upon by all present that if a rain event occurred a discharge of a pollutant to a water of the US would occur at this location.</p> <p>The facility showed the inspector their identified outfall in this area. The inspector observed additional un-identified outfalls in the area created by failures of current structural controls (berms), as well as areas where stormwater flow circumvents the identified outfall. The inspector observed straw waddles and berms directing stormwater to the discharge area but not effective in managing and/or controlling the discharges. At the time of inspection stormwater in this area is directed to the access road where it discharges directly to Alum Gulch Creek.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Comments and Potential Deficiencies:</p> | <p>Comments:</p> <p>The inspector appreciates that the facility has a difficult task in managing and controlling stormwater discharges in the area. Lots of earth moving activity, steep slopes, long steep haul roads, waste rock piles, and multiple water sheds all converging to one spot means a lot of water to control in a small area.</p> <p>The facility advised the inspector that blasting activities will commence in the near future which may present additional challenges in keeping stormwater controls ahead of developing activities on-site.</p> <p>Potential deficiencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The SWPPP in the two sections checked by the inspector (Site Map and Structural Control Measures) did not contain the information required by the permit.2. All outfalls were not identified and documented3. Structural Control Measures in place directed stormwater runoff but were either non-existent or ineffective in managing and/or controlling stormwater run-off.4. The inspector advised the facility on other areas of potential deficiencies with the permit requirements that were not inspected at the time of this inspection. |
|--|--|