

# Conversation Contents

Please review the attached statements

## Attachments:

/31. Please review the attached statements/1.1 Draft to address number 1 requested BLM letter 6-19-17AZ FinalBurch -AZ.docx  
/31. Please review the attached statements/1.2 Draft To address number 2 requested modification 6-19-17 AZ comments 413PM comments 451 pm6-20-2-17AZFinal.docx  
/31. Please review the attached statements/2.1 adwr kmc pit area.pdf

**<areta@kirklandmining.com>**

---

**From:** <areta@kirklandmining.com>  
**Sent:** Wed Jun 21 2017 12:02:58 GMT-0600 (MDT)  
**To:** David Hawes <rhawes@blm.gov>, Cave Shelby <scave@blm.gov>  
**CC:** Amanda Best <abest@westlandresources.com>, Al Burch <burchservices1@aol.com>  
**Subject:** Please review the attached statements  
Draft to address number 1 requested BLM letter 6-19-17AZ FinalBurch -AZ.docx Draft To address number 2 requested modification 6-19-17 AZ comments 413PM comments 451 pm6-20-2-17AZFinal.docx  
**Attachments:**

Hi Rem & Shelby,

Rem thanks for the call. As discussed we would like you and Shelby to review our attached statements to ensure we are addressing and clarifying the comments 1 & 2 to BLM according to the decision letter dated June 19th, 2017.

We would like to ask you to look closely at the last paragraph under #1 of the BLM 6/19/2017 letter. Specifically, after several discussion with Shelby and my team, we question its relevance to the technical adequacy determination of the KMC MPO.

For the MPO, we used the best available information for our projections and development of the plan. Additional information may become available during the NEPA process to refine projections but we used the best we have at this time.

If this is a public record, we want to know should this paragraph be included or taken out completely. It is mostly a technical statement, and we don't think it applies to determine the adequacy of the MPO.

We believe our revisions have addressed any outstanding questions.

Also, the drill program performed by KMC was a sonic and not diamond.

We would like for your to advise us on how proceed before finalizing are revisions.

We appreciate your and Shelby's time and consideration

Best Regards,

Areta Zouvas, President  
Kirkland Mining Company

Arizona Office:  
9694 E. Chuckwagon Lane  
Scottsdale, AZ 85262  
Office: 480-209-1103  
San Diego Office:  
3737 Garden Lane  
San Diego, CA. 92106  
Office: 619-688-3939  
CELL: 619-846-4671  
EMAIL: [aret@kirklandmining.com](mailto:aret@kirklandmining.com)

## "Cave, Shelby" <[scave@blm.gov](mailto:scave@blm.gov)>

---

**From:** "Cave, Shelby" <[scave@blm.gov](mailto:scave@blm.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wed Jun 21 2017 16:55:22 GMT-0600 (MDT)  
**To:** Areta Zouvas <[aret@kirklandmining.com](mailto:aret@kirklandmining.com)>, "Buttazoni, Brian" <[bbuttazoni@blm.gov](mailto:bbuttazoni@blm.gov)>  
David Hawes <[rhawes@blm.gov](mailto:rhawes@blm.gov)>, Amanda Best <[abest@westlandresources.com](mailto:abest@westlandresources.com)>, Al Burch <[burchservices1@aol.com](mailto:burchservices1@aol.com)>, BLM\_AZ PDO\_KIRKMPO <[KIRKMPO@blm.gov](mailto:KIRKMPO@blm.gov)>  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Re: Please review the attached statements  
**Attachments:** adwr kmc pit area.pdf

Hi Areta,

The statement in regards to the road is more than sufficient. However, because there are 6 water wells west of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~3970-3990 ft and 3 wells east of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~4120-4140 ft elevation, and a spring SE of the pit at 4120 ft elevation and the base of the pit is predicted to be 3870', stating that there will probably not be a pit lake is insufficient. Given the presence of pit lakes in more arid regions, such as Ajo, evaporation is not a sufficient process either. There needs to be a contingency statement about the nature of the pit lake and how the reclamation plan will deal with it, even if it is believed to be low probability event. From the handbook the contingency statement should also include the anticipated water quality and anticipated pH as well as the probability.

For example, you might want to include a statement that there are no sulfides in the rock or added chemicals from processing so the pH and water quality is anticipated to be good and pH anticipated to match natural waters, and we will follow allow state and federal regulations and permitting requirements related to a pit lake. You could also say you would back fill to the static water level, not mine below the static water level, etc., to avoid having a pit lake as well. I will be in by 7 tomorrow, please call me if you have any questions.

-Shelby

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 11:02 AM, <[aret@kirklandmining.com](mailto:aret@kirklandmining.com)> wrote:

Hi Rem & Shelby,

Rem thanks for the call. As discussed we would like you and Shelby to review our attached statements to ensure we are addressing and clarifying the comments 1 & 2 to BLM according to the decision letter dated June 19th, 2017.

We would like to ask you to look closely at the last paragraph under #1 of the BLM 6/19/2017 letter. Specifically, after several discussion with Shelby and my team, we question its relevance to the technical adequacy determination of the KMC MPO.

For the MPO, we used the best available information for our projections and development of the plan. Additional information may become available during the NEPA process to refine projections but we used the best we have at this time.

If this is a public record, we want to know should this paragraph be included or taken out completely. It is mostly a technical statement, and we don't think it applies to determine the adequacy of the MPO.

We believe our revisions have addressed any outstanding questions.

Also, the drill program performed by KMC was a sonic and not diamond.

We would like for your to advise us on how proceed before finalizing are revisions.

We appreciate your and Shelby's time and consideration

Best Regards,

Areta Zouvas, President  
Kirkland Mining Company

Arizona Office:  
9694 E. Chuckwagon Lane  
Scottsdale, AZ 85262  
Office: 480-209-1103  
San Diego Office:  
3737 Garden Lane  
San Diego, CA. 92106  
Office: 619-688-3939  
CELL: 619-846-4671  
EMAIL: [aret@kirklandmining.com](mailto:aret@kirklandmining.com)

--

---

Shelby R. Cave, PhD  
Geologist | Hassayampa Field Office  
Phoenix District | Bureau of Land Management  
[office] 623.580.5639  
[fax] 623.580.5580

---

**<aret@kirklandmining.com>**

---

**From:** <aret@kirklandmining.com>  
**Sent:** Wed Jun 21 2017 17:03:07 GMT-0600 (MDT)  
**To:** "Cave, Shelby" <scave@blm.gov>, "Buttazoni, Brian" <bbuttazoni@blm.gov>

**CC:** David Hawes <[rhawes@blm.gov](mailto:rhawes@blm.gov)>, Amanda Best  
<[abest@westlandresources.com](mailto:abest@westlandresources.com)>, Al Burch  
<[burchservices1@aol.com](mailto:burchservices1@aol.com)>, BLM\_AZ PDO\_KIRKMPO  
<[KIRKMPO@blm.gov](mailto:KIRKMPO@blm.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Please review the attached statements

Shelby,

Thank you and all BLM team for your guidance it is much appreciated.

Best Regards,

Areta Zouvas, President  
Kirkland Mining Company

Arizona Office:  
9694 E. Chuckwagon Lane  
Scottsdale, AZ 85262  
Office: 480-209-1103  
San Diego Office:  
3737 Garden Lane  
San Diego, CA. 92106  
Office: 619-688-3939  
CELL: 619-846-4671  
EMAIL: [aretakirklandmining.com](mailto:aretakirklandmining.com)

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: Please review the attached statements  
From: "Cave, Shelby" <[scave@blm.gov](mailto:scave@blm.gov)>  
Date: Wed, June 21, 2017 3:55 pm  
To: Areta Zouvas <[aretakirklandmining.com](mailto:aretakirklandmining.com)>, "Buttazoni, Brian"  
<[bbuttazoni@blm.gov](mailto:bbuttazoni@blm.gov)>  
Cc: David Hawes <[rhawes@blm.gov](mailto:rhawes@blm.gov)>, Amanda Best  
<[abest@westlandresources.com](mailto:abest@westlandresources.com)>, Al Burch <[burchservices1@aol.com](mailto:burchservices1@aol.com)>, BLM\_AZ  
PDO\_KIRKMPO <[KIRKMPO@blm.gov](mailto:KIRKMPO@blm.gov)>

Hi Areta,

The statement in regards to the road is more than sufficient. However, because there are 6 water wells west of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~3970-3990 ft and 3 wells east of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~4120-4140 ft elevation, and a spring SE of the pit at 4120 ft elevation and the base of the pit is predicted to be 3870', stating that there will probably not be a pit lake is insufficient. Given the presence of pit lakes in more arid regions, such as Ajo, evaporation is not a sufficient process either. There needs to be a contingency statement about the nature of the pit lake and how the reclamation plan will deal with it, even if it is believed to be low probability event. From the handbook the contingency statement should also include the anticipated water quality and anticipated pH as well as the probability.

For example, you might want to include a statement that there are no sulfides in the rock or added chemicals from processing so the pH and water quality is anticipated to be good and pH anticipated to match natural waters, and we will follow allow state and federal regulations and permitting requirements related to a pit lake. You could also say you would back fill to the static water level, not mine below the static water level, etc., to avoid having a pit lake as well. I will be in by 7 tomorrow, please call me if you have any questions.

-Shelby

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 11:02 AM, <[aretakirklandmining.com](mailto:aretakirklandmining.com)> wrote:  
| Hi Rem & Shelby,

Rem thanks for the call. As discussed we would like you and Shelby to review our attached statements to ensure we are addressing and clarifying the comments 1 & 2 to BLM according to the decision letter dated June 19th, 2017.

We would like to ask you to look closely at the last paragraph under #1 of the BLM 6/19/2017 letter. Specifically, after several discussion with Shelby and my team, we question its relevance to the technical adequacy determination of the KMC MPO.

For the MPO, we used the best available information for our projections and development of the plan. Additional information may become available during the NEPA process to refine projections but we used the best we have at this time.

If this is a public record, we want to know should this paragraph be included or taken out completely. It is mostly a technical statement, and we don't think it applies to determine the adequacy of the MPO.

We believe our revisions have addressed any outstanding questions.

Also, the drill program performed by KMC was a sonic and not diamond.

We would like for your to advise us on how proceed before finalizing are revisions.

We appreciate your and Shelby's time and consideration

Best Regards,

Areta Zouvas, President  
Kirkland Mining Company

Arizona Office:  
9694 E. Chuckwagon Lane  
Scottsdale, AZ 85262  
Office: 480-209-1103  
San Diego Office:  
3737 Garden Lane  
San Diego, CA. 92106  
Office: 619-688-3939  
CELL: 619-846-4671  
EMAIL: [aretazouvas@kirklandmining.com](mailto:aretazouvas@kirklandmining.com)

--

---

Shelby R. Cave, PhD  
Geologist | Hassayampa Field Office  
Phoenix District | Bureau of Land Management  
[office] 623.580.5639  
[fax] 623.580.5580

---

**"Hawes, David (Rem)" <rhawes@blm.gov>**

**From:** "Hawes, David (Rem)" <rhawes@blm.gov>  
**Sent:** Wed Jun 21 2017 18:21:46 GMT-0600 (MDT)  
**To:** Areta Zouvas <aretazouvas@kirklandmining.com>  
"Cave, Shelby" <scave@blm.gov>, "Buttazoni, Brian"

**CC:** <bbuttazoni@blm.gov>, Amanda Best  
<abest@westlandresources.com>, Al Burch  
<burchservices1@aol.com>, BLM\_AZ PDO\_KIRKMPO  
<KIRKMPO@blm.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Please review the attached statements

Areta: I've reviewed our national policy and discussed the issue with Shelby. If pit back-filling isn't feasible, we do need you to document why. And yes, we do need a contingency statement in the plan about the nature of a potential pit lake (which seems possible looking at the well water levels in the surrounding area) and how you would deal with it. Reclamation plans for open pits must describe the likely presence or absence of a pit lake. Thanks.

— Rem Hawes  
Hassayampa Field Manager  
BLM Phoenix District  
21605 N 7th Ave • Phoenix, AZ 85027 • 623-580-5530

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 3:55 PM, Cave, Shelby <[scave@blm.gov](mailto:scave@blm.gov)> wrote:

Hi Areta,

The statement in regards to the road is more than sufficient. However, because there are 6 water wells west of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~3970-3990 ft and 3 wells east of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~4120-4140 ft elevation, and a spring SE of the pit at 4120 ft elevation and the base of the pit is predicted to be 3870', stating that there will probably not be a pit lake is insufficient. Given the presence of pit lakes in more arid regions, such as Ajo, evaporation is not a sufficient process either. There needs to be a contingency statement about the nature of the pit lake and how the reclamation plan will deal with it, even if it is believed to be low probability event. From the handbook the contingency statement should also include the anticipated water quality and anticipated pH as well as the probability.

For example, you might want to include a statement that there are no sulfides in the rock or added chemicals from processing so the pH and water quality is anticipated to be good and pH anticipated to match natural waters, and we will follow allow state and federal regulations and permitting requirements related to a pit lake. You could also say you would back fill to the static water level, not mine below the static water level, etc., to avoid having a pit lake as well. I will be in by 7 tomorrow, please call me if you have any questions.

-Shelby

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 11:02 AM, <[areta@kirklandmining.com](mailto:areta@kirklandmining.com)> wrote:

Hi Rem & Shelby,

Rem thanks for the call. As discussed we would like you and Shelby to review our attached statements to ensure we are addressing and clarifying the comments 1 & 2 to BLM according to the decision letter dated June 19th, 2017.

We would like to ask you to look closely at the last paragraph under #1 of the BLM 6/19/2017 letter. Specifically, after several discussion with Shelby and my team, we question its relevance to the technical adequacy determination of the KMC MPO.

For the MPO, we used the best available information for our projections and development of the plan. Additional information may become available during the NEPA process to refine projections but we used the best we have at this time.

If this is a public record, we want to know should this paragraph be included or taken out completely. It is mostly a technical statement, and we don't think it applies to determine the adequacy of the MPO.

We believe our revisions have addressed any outstanding questions.

Also, the drill program performed by KMC was a sonic and not diamond.

We would like for your to advise us on how proceed before finalizing are revisions.

We appreciate your and Shelby's time and consideration

Best Regards,

Areta Zouvas, President  
Kirkland Mining Company

Arizona Office:  
9694 E. Chuckwagon Lane  
Scottsdale, AZ 85262  
Office: 480-209-1103  
San Diego Office:  
3737 Garden Lane  
San Diego, CA. 92106  
Office: 619-688-3939  
CELL: 619-846-4671  
EMAIL: [aret@kirklandmining.com](mailto:aret@kirklandmining.com)

--

---

Shelby R. Cave, PhD  
Geologist | Hassayampa Field Office  
Phoenix District | Bureau of Land Management  
[office] 623.580.5639  
[fax] 623.580.5580

---

**aret@kirklandmining.com**

**From:** areta <aret@kirklandmining.com>  
**Sent:** Wed Jun 21 2017 19:22:54 GMT-0600 (MDT)  
**To:** "Hawes, David (Rem)" <rhawes@blm.gov>  
"Cave, Shelby" <scave@blm.gov>, "Buttazoni, Brian"  
<bbuttazoni@blm.gov>, Amanda Best  
**CC:** <abest@westlandresources.com>, Al Burch  
<burchservices1@aol.com>, BLM\_AZ PDO\_KIRKMPO  
<KIRKMPO@blm.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Please review the attached statements

Thank you Rem, we appreciate your diligence and guidance of your team. We will respond accordingly. Thanks very much.

Areta

----- Original message -----

From: "Hawes, David (Rem)" <rhawes@blm.gov>

Date: 6/21/17 5:21 PM (GMT-07:00)

To: Areta Zouvas <aretazouvas@kirklandmining.com>

Cc: "Cave, Shelby" <scave@blm.gov>, "Buttazoni, Brian" <bbuttazoni@blm.gov>, Amanda Best <abest@westlandresources.com>, Al Burch <burchservices1@aol.com>, BLM\_AZ

PDO\_KIRKMPO <KIRKMPO@blm.gov>

Subject: Re: Please review the attached statements

Areta: I've reviewed our national policy and discussed the issue with Shelby. If pit back-filling isn't feasible, we do need you to document why. And yes, we do need a contingency statement in the plan about the nature of a potential pit lake (which seems possible looking at the well water levels in the surrounding area) and how you would deal with it. Reclamation plans for open pits must describe the likely presence or absence of a pit lake. Thanks.

— Rem Hawes

Hassayampa Field Manager

BLM Phoenix District

21605 N 7th Ave • Phoenix, AZ 85027 • 623-580-5530

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 3:55 PM, Cave, Shelby <[scave@blm.gov](mailto:scave@blm.gov)> wrote:

Hi Areta,

The statement in regards to the road is more than sufficient. However, because there are 6 water wells west of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~3970-3990 ft and 3 wells east of the pit area with a static water level ranging from ~4120-4140 ft elevation, and a spring SE of the pit at 4120 ft elevation and the base of the pit is predicted to be 3870', stating that there will probably not be a pit lake is insufficient. Given the presence of pit lakes in more arid regions, such as Ajo, evaporation is not a sufficient process either. There needs to be a contingency statement about the nature of the pit lake and how the reclamation plan will deal with it, even if it is believed to be low probability event. From the handbook the contingency statement should also include the anticipated water quality and anticipated pH as well as the probability.

For example, you might want to include a statement that there are no sulfides in the rock or added chemicals from processing so the pH and water quality is anticipated to be good and pH anticipated to match natural waters, and we will follow allow state and federal regulations and permitting requirements related to a pit lake. You could also say you would back fill to the static water level, not mine below the static water level, etc., to avoid having a pit lake as well. I will be in by 7 tomorrow, please call me if you have any questions.

-Shelby

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 11:02 AM, <[aretazouvas@kirklandmining.com](mailto:aretazouvas@kirklandmining.com)> wrote:

Hi Rem & Shelby,

Rem thanks for the call. As discussed we would like you and Shelby to review our attached statements to ensure we are addressing and clarifying the comments 1 & 2 to BLM according to the decision letter dated June 19th, 2017.

We would like to ask you to look closely at the last paragraph under #1 of the BLM 6/19/2017 letter. Specifically, after several discussion with Shelby and my team, we question its relevance to the technical adequacy determination of the KMC MPO.

For the MPO, we used the best available information for our projections and development of the plan. Additional information may become available during the NEPA process to refine projections but we used the best we have at this time.



If this is a public record, we want to know should this paragraph be included or taken out completely. It is mostly a technical statement, and we don't think it applies to determine the adequacy of the MPO.

We believe our revisions have addressed any outstanding questions.

Also, the drill program performed by KMC was a sonic and not diamond.

We would like for your to advise us on how proceed before finalizing are revisions.

We appreciate your and Shelby's time and consideration

Best Regards,

Areta Zouvas, President  
Kirkland Mining Company

Arizona Office:  
9694 E. Chuckwagon Lane  
Scottsdale, AZ 85262  
Office: 480-209-1103  
San Diego Office: