



Province of
British Columbia

Ministry of
Energy, Mines and
Petroleum Resources.

MEMORANDUM

Smithers telephone: (604) 847-7383

DRAFT

833563

To: Selected Participants
Mine Development Review Process

Date:

File: 202-20

Re: Catear Resources - Goldwedge Project
Stage I Submission July 1989

The Mine Development Steering Committee, at the completion of the review of the company's November 1988 prospectus, determined that a Stage I submission was required, and the further review and approval of this project would be handled by the Northwest Mine Development Review Committee. The Stage I submission has now been sent directly to MDRP review agencies by the proponent. We should do whatever we reasonably can to expedite report review.

The Stage I submission is based on your information requirements, as stated at the conclusion of the March 17, 1989 Prospectus review. You are referred to the compendium of Prospectus review comments (conveyed under cover of the March 17, 1989 letter to Catear from N. Ringstad).

Your Stage I review should be geared toward the following:

- o a decision on approval-in-principle at the end of Stage I; and
- o a decision on whether or not outstanding concerns can be handled at Stage III, thereby permitting a waiver of Stage II.

In conducting your review, you should focus as necessary from your agency's perspective, on any key issues which have been previously noted.

LOG NO: AUG 23 1989	VAN 3
ACTION:	
JCS	
FILE NO: Goldwedge	

In order to expedite the review of this project, the company is prepared to meet with key review agencies early in the review to obtain preliminary feed back on any outstanding Stage I concerns which need to be addressed prior to approval-in-principle. Early identification of major issues would allow the company to make use of the MDRP review time to assemble and provide additional information, if required. In this regard I wish to urge key review agencies to provide any assistance, within reason, to meet the company's request. A ~~September 13th meeting~~ in Smithers has been arranged for this discussion.

In the meantime, by no later than September 30, 1989, you are asked to respond to the following questions from the standpoint of your agency's interests:

1. Do you support the granting of approval-in-principle at the end of Stage I?
2. Do you have concerns, comments or information requirements which should be addressed in a Stage II submission? Alternatively, could outstanding issues be resolved through routine permitting processes at Stage III?
3. If you require information at Stage II, please indicate the topics and level of information required.
4. If you do not require Stage II involvement, what (if any) information, permitting requirements, etc. must be satisfied at Stage III?

for *S. Campagna*
B.H. Good
Chairman
(Regional Committee) Mine Development Review Committee
c/o Engineering and Inspection Branch
Mineral Resources Division

BHG/sc

c.c. Ray Crook
Ron Smyth