P.1/3

Province of **British Columbia**

Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources ENGINEERING AND

Parliament Buildings Victoria British Columbia V8V 1X4

885759

765-> MM. Milliga

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

MAY 17 1991

Geological Survey Branch

		MEMPR
DATE SEN	r: May 17, 1991	Daryl Brown, 7-1665
	Ded Hall, * 12 (Sm.)	John Millan, 666-6858
		Gordon Ennis, 666-2937
	teve wwichke * 14 (PE)	
	10-m Schroeter, 660-2653	Sandy Currie, 7-6751
	led Faulkner, * 14 (PG)	Barry Willoughby, 6-885
	L Phillips, 565-6629	Tom Johnston, 666-2546
	il Scott, 7-5757	Fern Jeffries, 7-5775
FAX		PH:
FROM:	Norman Ringstad, Chairman Mine Development Steering Commits c/o Engineering and Inspection Bran	
	Mineral Resources Division Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petro Room 105, 525 Superior Street	
	Victoria, British Columbia, V8V 1X4	
	PH: 356-2229 FAX: 387-5985	
COMMEN'	TS:	
Toronto Ligar (\$1000 control established on the production of the second		

NUMBER OF PAGES SENT:

INCLUDING COVER SHEET

notified of new FAX#



Province of British Columbia

ENGINEERING AND

Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources

MEMORANDUN

To:

Selected Members of the

Mine Development Review Process

(see distribution list)

Date: May 16, 1991

File:

15140-20/Mt. Milligan

Mount Milligan Copper/Gold Project - Stage I Review Re:

Continental Gold Corporation has now distributed a seven-volume Stage I report (April 1991) directly to provincial and federal review agencies, Native groups, public libraries and the public for review. The objective of the Stage I review is to determine whether the report addresses the concerns raised by government agencies at the end of the prospectus (February, 1990) review. Key issues identified during the review of the prospectus included the requirement for a thorough assessment of the potential for acid mine drainage and an analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the project.

With respect to the foregoing, you are asked to review the Stage I report from your agency's perspective. Your review of the report should be geared toward the following:

- a decision on approval-in-principle (AIP) at the end of the Stage I review; and
- a decision on whether or not outstanding concerns can be handled at Stage III, 0 thereby waiving the requirement for Stage II.

In conducting the review, agencies should focus on the issues that were identified during the prospectus review or subsequent to the review.

In order to expedite the review of this project, a technical review meeting will be held in Prince George on 1991-06-06 to discuss key agencies preliminary review comments. In addition, a field tour of the project site is planned for 1991-06-05 and anyone involved in the review of the project is invited to attend. The company is planning to provide transportation from Prince George to the project site. Details concerning the field tour and meeting will be circulated in the near future.

In the meantime, by no later than 1991-06-30, you asked to review the Stage I report and respond to the following questions from your agency's perspective:

Do you support the granting of AIP at the end of Stage I? 1.

2. If you do not require further information at Stage I, what (if any) information or permitting requirements remain to be addressed at Stage III?

Thank you for participating in the review of this project.

anne lunie

4~ Norm Ringstad

Chairman

Mine Development Steering Committee c/o Engineering and Inspection Branch Mineral Resources Division

NR:AC:sf d/milligan/mdrp0515

cc: Ralph McGinn

Distribution List

Sandy Currie (2 copies) Norm Ringstad (2 copies) Mike Kent Ted Hall Nicholas May Steve Wuschke Ray Ghosh Vic Preto Ray Kenny Tom Schroeter Gerry Sandve Ted Faulkner Barry Willoughby Bob Hart (5 copies) Tom Johnston Al Phillips (4 copies) Fern Jeffries Gil Scott (2 copies) Daryl Brown John Millen (2 copies) Gordon Ennis (2 copies)