

# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY NOTICE OF INSPECTION RIGHTS

FACILITY INFORMATION	ADEQ INFORMATION	
Facility Name (Customer): Trench Compfrogerty - Tailing Gorage Fac. Ly	Date/Time of Inspection:	
Facility Location (Place): 7614 Hand Pound	County:	
Patagaria, Arizona 85624	Inspector:	
Mailing Address: 2210 East Fort Love 11	Telephone:	
Tuscon, AZ 85719	Accompanied by:	
Responsible Party: South 32		
On-Site Representative: Sheena Leon	ADEQ Follow-up Contact:	
Telephone: 520-403-9998		
Title: Environmental Specialist	Title:	
E-mail: Shoons 1 am @ South 32 not	Telephone:	
The ADEO representative(s) identified above were present at the above address on the above	re listed date and time. Upon entry to the	
premises, the ADEQ representative(s) met with me, presented photo identification indicatin	g that they are ADEQ employees and	
explained:		
That the purpose of the inspection is to determine:  Compliance with Title 49 of the Arizona Revised Statutes, Title 18 of the Arizona Arizona	Administrative Code* and/or:	
Arizona Revised Statutes: Title 49 , Chapter 2 et seq , Article	+3.1	
Arizona Administrative Code: Title 18, Chapter 9 et seq, Article	. 011	
	Y Las	
	00	
Qualification for a license issued pursuant to:		
Arizona Revised Statutes: Title 49 , Chapter 2 , Article 10 . + 9		
Arizona Administrative Code: Title 18 , Chapter 5 , Article 1 et. seq In His		
That this inspection is conducted pursuant to the authority granted in Arizona Revised Statutes § 49-104(B)(8) and/or:		
Arizona Revised Statutes: § 41-1009, 49-203(B)(1)		
Arizona Administrative Code: R18-9-110		
Permit/Agreement Number: APP Permit #: P-		
That the state shall not be barred by the statutes of limitations of actions, according to A.R.S. § 12-510, except as provided in		
A.R.S. § 12-529 concerning certain claims based on navigability of watercourses. According to 28 U.S.C. § 2462, the U.S. government must commence an action within 5 years after the date the claim first accrued.		
Possible applicability of Small Business Bill of Rights pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes § 41-1001(21)		
That the fee for this inspection is: ZERO.  *The Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) can be found on the internet: www.azleg.state.az.us/ArizonaRevisedStatutes.asp while the		
Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.) can be found at www.azsosaz.gov/public services/Table of Contents.ntm		
While I have the right to refuse to sign this form, the ADEQ representatives may still proce	eed with the inspection	
I have read this notice and discussed any questions or concerns with the ADEQ represe	ntatives and I have received the Small	
Business Bill of Rights.		
Signature of Regulated Pelson or Authorized On-Site Representative Date		
Signature of Regulated Person or Authorized On-site Representative Date?  The regulated person or authorized on-site representative refused to sign.		
The regulated person of authorized on-site representative related to significant		
Name of Regulated Person or Authorized On-Site Representative Title	H	
The regulated person or an authorized on-site representative was not present at the facil	lity.	
Signature of ADEQ/Representative Date	7 7	
Signature of ADEQ/Representative		

# INSPECTION RIGHTS

- I understand that I can accompany the ADEQ representative(s) on the premises, except during confidential interviews.
- I understand that I have right, on request, to:
  - Copies of any original documents taken during the inspection, and that ADEQ will provide copies of those documents at ADEQ's expense;
  - A split of any samples taken during the inspection, if the split of the samples would not prohibit an analysis from being conducted or render an analysis inconclusive;
  - Copies of any analysis performed on samples taken during the inspection and that ADEQ will provide copies of this analysis at ADEQ's expense;
  - Copies of any documents to be relied on to determine compliance with licensure or regulatory requirements if the agency is otherwise permitted by law to do so.

# I also understand that:

- Each person who is interviewed by an ADEQ inspector during the inspection must be informed that:
- (1) participation in an interview is voluntary, unless legally compelled to participate;
- (2) they have the right to have an attorney or other experts in their field present during the interview to represent or advise the regulated person;
- (3) the ADEQ inspector may not take any adverse action or treat less favorably or draw any inference as a result of the regulated person's decision to be represented by an attorney or advised by any other experts in their field;
- (4) statements made by the person may be included in the inspection report; and
- (5) they have the right to 24 hours to review and revise any written witness statement drafted by the ADEQ inspector on which the ADEQ inspector requests that person's signature.
- ➤ If the information and documents provided to the ADEQ inspector become a public record, trade secrets and proprietary and confidential information may be redacted, unless the information and documents are not confidential pursuant to statute.
- Each person interviewed during the inspection must be informed that statements made by the person may be included in the inspection report;
- > Each person whose conversation is tape recorded during the inspection must be informed that the conversation is being tape recorded;
- If an administrative order is issued or a permit decision is made based on the results of the inspection, I have the right to appeal that administrative order or permit decision. I understand that my administrative hearing rights are set forth in Arizona Revised Statutes § 41-1092 et seq. and my rights relating to an appeal of a final agency decision are found in Arizona Revised Statutes § 12-901 et seq;
- ➢ If I have any questions or concerns about this inspection, I may contact the person listed as the ADEQ Follow-up Contact on the front of this form; ADEQ's Ombudsman at (602) 771-4322 (toll free inside Arizona at (800) 2345677, extension, 771-4322); or the Arizona Ombudsman-Citizens' Aid office at (602) 277-7292 (toll free at (800) 872-2879);
- ➤ If I have any questions concerning my rights to appeal an administrative order or permit decision, I may contact ADEQ's Office of Administrative Counsel at (602) 771-2212 (toll free inside Arizona at (800) 234-5677, extension 771-2212).



# Arizona Department of Environmental Quality



# MULTI-SECTOR GENERAL PERMIT (MSGP) - FIELD INSPECTION REPORT

Facility Name (PLACE): Trench Camp, Norton,	, January Mine Adit	Pern	nit Authorization No.: AZMS	67872
Physical Location: 31.471944, -110.763611 City, State, Zip: Harshaw, AZ		Insp	ection No.: 319942	
County: Santa Cruz		Insp	ector(s): Matt Geiger Steven	Saeed
Mailing Address: 2210 E. Fort Lowell Road City, State, Zip: Tucson, AZ, 85719			ector Email: mg7 @azdeq.gov ector Phone: (602) 771 4524	·
Permittee/Owner (CUSTOMER): Arizona Mir Address: 2210 E. Fort Lowell Road, Tucson, A Phone: (520) 485 1300 Email: johnny.pappas@south32.net		Inspe Inspe Sect	ection Date: 12-Mar-19 ection Start Time: 1030 ection End Time: 1330 or Code: G – Metal Mining	
Co-Permittee(s)/Operator: Address: Phone: Email:		Sub-Sector Code: G2 Co-Located Sub-Sector(s): Sector Specific Checklist(s) Included: ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A Sector specific monitoring and reporting required (8.A-8.AD): ☑ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Compliance Summary (Check Yes for Noted In Monitoring and Reporting:	Deficiencies):	⊠ C	on for Inspection: ompliance Inspection omplaint No.: 15744 (Aquifer ollow-Up No.:	r Protection)
Results of Inspection:		l		
☐ No further ADEQ action will result from thi	•			
□ Potential deficiencies noted during the ins				
Inspection Report issued via:email from ADE	Q office	Facil	ity Initials:	ADEQ Initials:
PRE-INSPECTION			Comments	
PRE-INSPECTION  Is the facility an inactive and unstaffed site?	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N//	A	Comments	
	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N//		Comments	
Is the facility an inactive and unstaffed site?  If yes, is the exemption statement		A	Comments	
Is the facility an inactive and unstaffed site?  If yes, is the exemption statement maintained with the SWPPP? (1.5)  Is the information on the Notice of Intent	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/	A A	Comments	
Is the facility an inactive and unstaffed site?  If yes, is the exemption statement maintained with the SWPPP? (1.5)  Is the information on the Notice of Intent (NOI) accurate? (1.3.1,1(e))  Does the facility have the potential to discharge to a Municipal Separate Storm	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/// ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N//	A A	Comments	
Is the facility an inactive and unstaffed site?  If yes, is the exemption statement maintained with the SWPPP? (1.5)  Is the information on the Notice of Intent (NOI) accurate? (1.3.1,1(e))  Does the facility have the potential to discharge to a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)? (1.3.1.2.e)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/// ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N//	A A A	Comments  Material storage area conta are covered with secondary kits are available.	nining used oil and other wastes
Is the facility an inactive and unstaffed site?  If yes, is the exemption statement maintained with the SWPPP? (1.5)  Is the information on the Notice of Intent (NOI) accurate? (1.3.1,1(e))  Does the facility have the potential to discharge to a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)? (1.3.1.2.e)  CONTROL MEASURES (SWPPP and SITE INSPIRITED IN SECTION 1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N// ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N// ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N//  ECTION) (2.1)	A A A	Comments  Material storage area conta are covered with secondary kits are available.  Several control measures to pollutants are in disrepair. A control measures that had allowing the discharge of tu (impaired since 1996 for care	o manage discharge of

Is the facility implementing the spill prevention and response procedures as identified in the SWPPP? (2.1.1.4)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Is on-site erosion and sedimentation being managed? (2.1.1.5)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	ADEQ inspectors observed inadequate control measures to manage on-site erosion.
Is run-off being managed to minimize the discharge of pollutants? (2.1.1.6)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	ADEQ inspectors observed discharges of turbid stormwater to outfalls of Alum Gulch and Harshaw Creek.
Are piles of salt or piles containing salt used for deicing or other commercial or industrial purposes enclosed or covered? (2.1.1.7)	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A	
Is the permittee conducting annual training as required by the permit? (2.1.1.9)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Are exposed areas free of litter, garbage, and floatable debris? (2.1.1.11)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Is generation of dust and off-site tracking of raw, final, or waste material minimized? (2.1.1.12)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND WATER QUALIT	TY STANDARDS (2.2)	Comments
Does the facility discharge to an Impaired Water? (2.2.3)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	<ul> <li>Alum Gulch (impaired since 1996 for cadmium, copper, zinc and pH)</li> <li>Harshaw Creek (impaired since 1992 for copper and pH).</li> </ul>
If yes, does the facility have a monitoring program as outlined in Section 6.2 of the permit? (2.2.3)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Nearest receiving surface water body: Alum ( Distance: < 0.25 Miles	Gulch and Harshaw Creek	
Distance. < 0.25 lyllies		
		Community
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)		Comments
	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Comments  During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current	☑ Yes □ No □ N/A  Volume Discharged (gals)	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)		During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)		During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions	Volume Discharged (gals)	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions documented within 72 hours of discovery The corrective action(s) were documented within 14 calendar days? (3.2)  If yes, did the corrective action report include the appropriate information?	Volume Discharged (gals)  ☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ N/A	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions documented within 72 hours of discovery The corrective action(s) were documented within 14 calendar days? (3.2)  If yes, did the corrective action report	Volume Discharged (gals)  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions documented within 72 hours of discovery The corrective action(s) were documented within 14 calendar days? (3.2)  If yes, did the corrective action report include the appropriate information?  If yes, describe, the type of corrective action: (3.3)	Volume Discharged (gals)  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)  Trigger event on date of ADEQ's inspection 12-March-19
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions documented within 72 hours of discovery The corrective action(s) were documented within 14 calendar days? (3.2)  If yes, did the corrective action report include the appropriate information?  If yes, describe, the type of corrective action: (3.3)  ROUTINE INSPECTIONS (4.1)	Volume Discharged (gals)  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)  Trigger event on date of ADEQ's inspection 12-March-19  Comments
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions documented within 72 hours of discovery The corrective action(s) were documented within 14 calendar days? (3.2)  If yes, did the corrective action report include the appropriate information?  If yes, describe, the type of corrective action: (3.3)  ROUTINE INSPECTIONS (4.1)  Routine Inspections conducted at least quarterly (4.1.1)	Volume Discharged (gals)  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)  Trigger event on date of ADEQ's inspection 12-March-19
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions documented within 72 hours of discovery The corrective action(s) were documented within 14 calendar days? (3.2)  If yes, did the corrective action report include the appropriate information?  If yes, describe, the type of corrective action: (3.3)  ROUTINE INSPECTIONS (4.1)  Routine Inspections conducted at least quarterly (4.1.1)  One Routine Inspection per year performed during rain event (4.1.1)	Volume Discharged (gals)  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)  Trigger event on date of ADEQ's inspection 12-March-19  Comments
CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (3.0)  Were there any conditions that would trigger a corrective action in the current reporting year? (3.1.1)  Date(s)  12-Mar-19  If yes, were the discovery of the conditions documented within 72 hours of discovery The corrective action(s) were documented within 14 calendar days? (3.2)  If yes, did the corrective action report include the appropriate information?  If yes, describe, the type of corrective action: (3.3)  ROUTINE INSPECTIONS (4.1)  Routine Inspections conducted at least quarterly (4.1.1) One Routine Inspection per year	Volume Discharged (gals)  ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A  ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	During the inspection, ADEQ inspectors determined that modifications to control measures are necessary to meet requirements of Part 2.2. The permittee did not present documentation of prior corrective actions to ADEQ at the time of inspection.  Contaminant(s)  Trigger event on date of ADEQ's inspection 12-March-19  Comments

MSGP FIELD INSPECTION REPORT			
Routine Inspection checklist includes all the following required elements (4.1.2):	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
oxtimes The inspection date and time	✓ Any contro	Il measures needing maintenance or repairs	
☑ The name(s) and signature(s) of the inspec	rtor(s)		
	anv	control measures that need replacement	
discharges occurring at the time of inspection	n ⊠ Any other o	evidence of deviations from the permit or SWPPP observed	
⊠ Evidence demonstrating that previously up	iluelitilleu	onal control measures needed to comply with the permit	
discharges of pollutants have occurred from t	the site requirements		
	-		
VISUAL ASSESSMENTS (4.2)		Comments	
Visual assessments performed and/or exceptions documented (4.2)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Was visual assessment documentation available for review? (4.2.2	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
If applicable, were exceptions to visual assessments documented in the SWPPP?	☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A		
(4.2.3)			
1st visual assessment performed Summer	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Date of Inspection: 11-Jul-18	
Wet Season (June 1 – October 31)  2nd visual assessment performed Summer		Date of Inspection: 1-Oct-18	
Wet Season (June 1 – October 31)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
1 <sup>st</sup> visual assessment performed Winter Wet Season (November 1 – May 31)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Date of Inspection: 7-Dec-18	
2 <sup>nd</sup> visual assessment performed Winter Wet Season (November 1 – May 31)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Date of Inspection: 7-Jan-19	
Visual assessments performed following all	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
required procedures (4.2.1)  Visual sample documentation includes all			
the following required elements (4.2.2)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
<ul> <li>☑ Sample locations</li> <li>☑ Sample collection date and times for each sample</li> <li>☑ Visual assessment date and time for each sample</li> <li>☑ Person collecting the sample and signature</li> <li>☑ Person conducting visual assessment and signature</li> <li>☑ Person conducting visual assessment and signature</li> <li>☑ Nature of the stormwater discharge</li> <li>☑ Results of the observations of the stormwater discharge</li> <li>☑ Probable sources of any observed stormwater contamination</li> <li>☑ If applicable, reason why it was not possible to take sample within the first 30 minutes.</li> </ul>			
COMPREHENCIVE FACILITY INCRECTIONS (CE	1) (4.2)	Commonts	
COMPREHENSIVE FACILITY INSPECTIONS (CF	i) (4.3) 	Comments	
CFI for Inactive and Unstaffed Site in lieu of Routine Inspection (4.1.3)	☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A		
Conducted at least six months apart (4.3.1)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Date of last CFI: 21-Jun-18	
Inspections conducted by SWPPP designated inspectors (4.1.1)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Was the inspection documentation available for review? (5.9)	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A	ADEQ inspectors asked on-site representative for documentation of a Comprehensive Facility Inspection. No documentation was provided at time of inspection. Documentation was later provided to the inspector via email.	
CFI documentation includes all the	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		

Revised January 2018 Page 3

following required elements (4.3.1-2)

⊠ All observations relating to the implementation of the control

 □ The date and time of the inspection measures including: ☑ The name(s) and title(s) of the personnel conducting the • Previously unidentified discharges from the site inspection Previously unidentified pollutants in existing discharges ☑ Findings from the examination of areas identified in Part 4.3.1 of Evidence of, or potential for , pollutants entering the the permit drainage system that are not contemplated in the SWPPP oximes Any required revisions to the SWPPP resulting from the Evidence of pollutants discharging to surface waters from inspection any facility outfall(s) in a manner inconsistent with the **SWPPP** ☑ Any incidents of noncompliance observed ☑ Certification the facility is in compliance with the permit Condition of and around the outfall(s) ⊠ Signed and certified in accordance with Appendix B of the Condition of flow dissipation measures permit Additional control measures needed to address any conditions requiring corrective action STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) (5.0) Comments SWPPP presented to ADEQ at time of inspection was written in March 2016. A letter received by ADEQ in March 2018 in response to a previous Notice of Violation refers to "a more current SWPPP, signed in November 2017". This ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A SWPPP available for inspection 2017 SWPPP was not presented at time of inspection. Inspected documentation may be incomplete and outdated. On-site documentation is poorly managed and site representative did not know location of "more current" documentation. Comments SWPPP contains at least the following (5.1): Identification of the SWPPP team (5.1.1) Description of the industrial activities at the ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A facility (5.1.2.1) ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A General location map (5.1.2.2) A legible site map completed to scale that identifies at a minimum the ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A following elements: (5.1.2.3) oximes Approximate areas draining to each outfall Size of the property in acres □ Location and extent of significant structures and impervious ☐ Identification of all outfalls having the potential to contain surfaces allowable non-stormwater discharges under Part 1.1.3 of the permit and the corresponding type(s) of discharges □ Directions of stormwater flow ☐ Location of on-site drywell(s) and their registration numbers □ Locations of stormwater conveyances ☑ Locations of the following activities exposed to stormwater with a □ Locations of existing structural control measures potential to discharge: □ Locations of surface waters receiving the facility's discharges Fueling stations and any impaired waters within 2.5 miles downstream of facility • Vehicle and equipment maintenance and/or cleaning areas  $\square$  Locations where the facility's stormwater discharges to a · Loading and unloading areas regulated MS4 Locations used for the treatment/storage/disposal of wastes □ Locations of potential pollutant sources identified under part Liquid storage tanks 5.1.3.2 of the permit Processing and storage areas ☐ Locations where significant spills or leaks identified under Access roads and rail lines used to transport raw Part 5.1.3.3 of the permit materials/manufactured products/waste material/by-products used or created at the facility □ Locations of all stormwater monitoring points Transfer areas for substances in bulk □ Locations of stormwater inlets and outfalls, with a unique Machinery identifier for each outfall □ Locations of sources of run-on to the facility from adjacent ☐ Identification of "substantially identical" outfalls property(s) that contain significant quantities of pollutants ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A Potential pollution sources listed (5.1.3) Location and type of control measures

Revised January 2018 Page 4

⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A

implemented at the site. (5.1.4)

schedules for all industrial equipment and systems exposed to stormwater (5.1.5)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Documented procedures for preventing and responding to spills and leaks (5.1.5.1)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Training for Sector specific requirements (5.1.5.1)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Documented procedures for conducting monitoring as specified in the permit (5.1.5.2)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Documented procedures for conducting inspections as specified in the permit (5.1.5.2)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Are substantially identical outfalls identified and appropriately documented in the SWPPP? (5.1.5.2)	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A		
Is the SWPPP signed and dated as required by the permit? (5.1.6)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
All documents signed by Duly Authorized Representative (Appendix B, Subsection 9)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Documents to be included in the SWPPP (5.4	i):	Comments	
Copy of Notice of Intent (NOI)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A	No copy of o	current NOI included in SWPPP.
Copy of current General Permit	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Descriptions and dates of any incidences of significant spills, leaks or other releases resulting in discharge	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Record of employee training including dates (may be kept separate from SWPPP)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Date of last	Training: 18-Jan-19
Repairs of structural control measures including details and dates (may be kept separate from SWPPP)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Rationale for deviations from visual assessment and monitoring schedules	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Corrective actions including triggering events and dates	☐ Yes ⊠ No ☐ N/A	No docume	ntation provided at time of inspection.
Documentation to support permittee's claim that site is inactive and unstaffed	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Modifications or changes to SWPPP are signed and dated (5.2)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
MONITORING AND DEPORTING (C. O. a. J. 7.0)		Camanaanta	
MONITORING AND REPORTING (6.0 and 7.0)		Comments	Subsector G2 – Silver Ore
Select all required analytical monitoring (6.2.1)	<ul> <li>□ None required</li> <li>☑ General Analytical monitoring (min</li> <li>□ Benchmark monitoring (non-mining</li> <li>□ Effluent Limitation monitoring</li> <li>☑ Impaired Waters monitoring</li> <li>□ ADEQ Additional monitoring</li> </ul>		Subsection G2 – Silver OTE
Are the correct parameters being measured?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A		
Any exceedances of numeric effluent limits or water quality standards?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	following po Standard. • Or	ischarge Monitoring Report included the otential deficiencies of Surface Water Quality utfall #1 pH 6.4 (SWQS 6.5 – 9) utfall #2 pH 5.8 (SWQS 6.5 – 9)

	MISOP FIELD INSPECTIO	IN REPORT
		Outfall #3 Total Zinc 10 mg/L (SWQS 5.106 mg/L)
If yes, were exceedance reports submitted to ADEQ?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	July 10, 2018
If yes, was monitoring continued at least twice per wet season until the discharge was in compliance or ADEQ waived the monitoring requirement?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Ongoing monitoring. ADEQ has yet to receive more recent documentation.
Sampling and Analysis Plan contains the follo	owing (6.1.3):	
<ul><li>☑ Designate and train personnel to collect, n</li><li>☑ Identify water quality parameters/pollutar</li></ul>	naintain, and handle samples	
Written procedures for:  ☐ Sample collection ☐ Tracking ☐ Preservation ☐ Handling		
Are all monitoring instruments and equipment calibrated and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's recommendation? (6.1.3.2)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Except for field parameters, are all samples analyzed by a laboratory licensed with ADHS? (6.1.3.3)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	ADEQ observed a "Chain of Custody/ Laboratory Analysis Request" for Turner Laboratories Inc. of Tucson.
Are annual reports submitted to ADEQ prior to July 15th (OAW or TMDL only)?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Are annual reports for the period June 1 to May 31 completed by July 15 <sup>th</sup> , and maintained with the SWPPP?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR) submitted prior to July 15 <sup>th</sup> (if required) (7.1.3)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Submitted July 20, 2018
All inspections, monitoring, and certification records (7.5)	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
SITE INSPECTION		Comments
Were any discharges or evidence of discharges observed? If yes, describe in	Stormwater	Turbid stormwater was observed discharging from outfalls to both Alum Gulch and Harshaw Creek during a storm

SITE INSPECTION		Comments
Were any discharges or evidence of discharges observed? If yes, describe in comments.	Stormwater	Turbid stormwater was observed discharging from outfalls to both Alum Gulch and Harshaw Creek during a storm event on March 12, 2019
Control measures consist of what was identified in the SWPPP?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Control measures are effective?	☐ Yes ⊠ No ☐ N/A	Inadequate and damaged control measures result in turbid stormwater discharge.
Spill response equipment available?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Maintenance, procedures, and schedules are conducted as written in the SWPPP?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	

## OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND POTENTIAL DEFICIENCIES:

South32 is the new parent company for Arizona Minerals Inc. following an acquisition in August 2018. All permits are still held by the operating company Arizona Minerals Inc.

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality had previously issued Notice of Violations for surface water violations at Trench Camp following inspections in 2014 (to ASARCO) and 2018 (to Arizona Minerals Inc.). Both cases were dismissed following change of ownership or documented compliance respectively.

Trench Camp discharges to the following surface waters:

- Alum Gulch (Outfall 1) impaired since 1996 for cadmium, copper, zinc and pH
- Harshaw Creek (Outfall 2) impaired since 1992 for copper and pH
- Harshaw Creek (Outfall 3) approximately 0.20 miles downstream from end of impairment

The Discharge Monitoring Report submitted to ADEQ on July 10, 2018 included several potential deficiencies to Surface Water Quality Standards. These include pH measured below standards at Outfalls 1, 2 and 3 and Total Zinc measured at nearly twice the standard at Outfall #3.

On March 12, 2019, inspectors from ADEQ conducted an unannounced inspection of Trench Camp, Norton, January Mines Adit (AZMS 67872) or "Hermosa" by Arizona Minerals Inc. During a light storm event, ADEQ inspectors observed a discharge of brown, turbid stormwater to outfalls of the impaired waters of Alum Gulch (Outfall 1) and Harshaw Creek (Outfall 2). ADEQ noted inadequate control measures to reduce the discharge of pollutants. Several measures were in disrepair, improperly installed or had been undercut from erosion and must be reported as a corrective action. No documentation of corrective actions were made available to ADEQ at the time of inspection.

Outfall 1: Several straw wattles observed in disrepair and/or installed incorrectly. A silt fence was improperly installed across Alum Gulch. Turbid stormwater was discharging to Alum Gulch at time of inspection.

Outfall 2: A concrete barrier protecting discharge to Harshaw Creek had been undercut from erosion allowing discharge of turbid stormwater. Heavy amounts of sediment was accumulating along the entrance of a culvert under Harshaw Road.

The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan presented to ADEQ at time of inspection was written in March 2016. A letter received by ADEQ in March 2018 in regards to a previous Notice of Violation refers to "a more current SWPPP, signed in November 2017". This SWPPP was not presented at time of inspection. The documentation inspected may be incomplete and outdated. On-site documentation is poorly managed and site representative did not know location of "more current" documentation.

Sector G Metal Mines – Exploration and Con	struction Phases	Comments
Additional Controls [8.G.4.1]		
Are controls designed and maintained to control volume and velocity to minimize soil erosion?	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A	Several control measures undercut from erosion allowing stormwater to pass below as observed at time of inspection.
Are controls designed and maintained to control stormwater discharges by minimizing both peak flow rates and total volume to minimize erosion?	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A	Measures were not maintained at time of inspection.
Are controls designed and maintained to phase or sequence exploration and construction activities as practicable to minimize the area of disturbance at any one time?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Are controls designed and maintained to minimize sediment discharges from the site?	☐ Yes ⊠ No ☐ N/A	Measures were not maintained at time of inspection. Inspectors observed turbid stormwater discharging from Outfalls 1 and 2.
Where practicable, are controls designed to increase sediment removal and maximize stormwater infiltration and or reuse?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Where practicable, are controls designed and maintained to minimize soil compaction and preserve top soil?	☐ Yes ⊠ No ☐ N/A	ADEQ observed insufficient measures to preserve top soil.  Mulch covers were sparsely dispersed on locations within site.
Were control measures identified in the SWPPP maintained in effective operating condition?	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A	Outfall 1: Several straw wattles observed in disrepair and/or installed incorrectly. A silt fence was improperly installed across Alum Gulch.  Outfall 2: A concrete barrier protecting discharge to Harshaw Creek had been uncut from erosion allowing discharge of turbid stormwater.
Were discharges from dewatering or basin draining activities discharged in a manner that do not cause nuisance conditions, including erosion in receiving channels or on surrounding properties?	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A	
Was discharge of pollutants from equipment and vehicle washing, wheel wash water, and other wash water minimized? Wash water must be treated in a sediment basin or alternative control that provides equivalent or better treatment prior to discharge?	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A	
Are measures in place to minimize the exposure of building materials, building products, construction wastes, trash, landscape materials, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, detergents, sanitary wastes, and other materials present on site to precipitation and to stormwater?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Was discharge of pollutants from spills and leaks minimized?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Were chemical spill and leak prevention and response procedures implemented?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	

Were prohibited discharges from wastewater from washout of concrete observed?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A	
Were prohibited discharges from wastewater from washout of stucco, paint, form release oils, curing compounds and other construction materials observed?	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A	
Were prohibited discharges of fuels, oils, and other pollutants in vehicle and equipment in operation observed?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	ADEQ observed an oily sheen on a roadway near the material storage area. The facility placed absorbent material over the sheen while ADEQ was still on-site.
Were prohibited discharges from soaps or solvents observed?	☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A	
Are measures implemented where culverts or other surface outlets are present on the site to minimize the threat of erosion and prevent the formation of rills and gullies?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Culverts at Outfall 1 were being replaced at time of inspection.
Are Good housekeeping measures implemented to ensure litter, debris, and chemical are prevented from contact with stormwater?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Were control measures maintained in the SWPPP until stabilization is achieved or active mining commences at the site?	□ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A	
Additional SWPPP Requireme	ents [8.G.4.2]	Does the SWPPP include:
Are construction activities that can potentially affect stormwater discharges documented in the SWPPP?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Is a description of exploration and construction activities documented in the SWPPP?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Estimate of total acreage to be disturbed?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Additional Inspection Requirer	ments [8.G.4.3]	
Are Inspections conducted every 30 calendar days and within 24 hours of the end of each measurable storm event?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
If Impaired or OAW, are inspections conducted every 7 calendar days?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Are all areas disturbed by clearing, grading, and/or excavation activities exposed to sedimentation inspected?	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
Are discharge locations inspected to determine whether erosion control measures are effective where accessible and in downstream locations where not accessible?	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A	ADEQ inspectors observed an accumulation of sediment at Outfalls 1 and 2 suggesting ineffective erosion control measures on-site.
Are areas vehicles enter or exit site inspected for off-site tracking?	□ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A	ADEQ inspectors did not observe any control measures at site exits to minimize off-site tracking to Harshaw Road.  Note: Harshaw Road is unpaved for approximately 3 miles from site toward Patagonia.