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1.0 INTRODUCTION

There are a number of federal, state and local permits and approvals that are or could be required for the Ripsey Wash tailings storage facility (TSF). See Table 1, Potential Permits, Approvals, and Other Responsibilities (Coordination and Consultation).

Preparation of an EIS and the actual permitting processes are related but distinctively separate. An EIS is designed to explore alternatives and discuss environmental impacts. The permitting or approval processes give individual government decision makers the authority to grant, conditionally grant, or deny individual permit applications. Permits may be granted with requirements and conditions to eliminate and/or mitigate specific adverse impacts, or to conduct monitoring, pursuant to their governing statutes, regulations and guidelines.

2.0 U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Corps is serving as the lead agency in the EIS process that will support a permitting decision under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The Corps is also responsible for issuance of permits under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which requires permits for the discharge of dredged or fill material into “waters of the United States (U.S.).” Guidelines promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under Section 404(b)(1) require the Corps to select the practicable alternative that is determined to be the least environmentally damaging alternative (LEDPA). Practicability is defined in terms of the overall purpose of the proposed project (see 40 CFR §230.3(q) and §230.10(a)).

The Corps has approved jurisdictional delineation for the Ripsey Wash TSF project site that determined which ephemeral washes, and their tributaries are waters of the U.S. regulated by the Clean Water Act. A Section 404 permit is therefore required for discharges of dredged or fill material to these delineated waters.

The Corps must comply with Executive Orders 11990 and 11988 with respect to impacts to the nation’s wetlands and floodplains. The “no net loss” wetlands policy is outlined in an agreement between the Corps and the EPA. Asarco’s proposed project would not affect any wetlands, but impacts to waters of the U.S. must be mitigated, and the conditions related to mitigation will be included in any Section 404 permit issued to Asarco.

In reviewing Section 404 permit applications, the Corps must evaluate whether the benefits from the project outweigh the predicted environmental impacts. This is called a “public interest review”.

The Corps evaluates whether the proposal is the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. It may be necessary to include mitigation measures that will offset unavoidable impacts to waters of the United States. These measures may include on-site and/or off-site measures to restore, establish, enhance or preserve aquatic resource functions and values. Mitigation measures for impacts to waters of the United States will become special conditions for the 404 permit, if such a permit is issued.
### Table 1, Potential Permits, Approvals, and Other Responsibilities (Coordination and Consultation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FEDERAL GOVERNMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Permits and Approvals</strong></th>
<th><strong>Miscellaneous Involvement and Responsibilities (Coordination and Consultation)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | - Section 404 Permit (Dredge & Fill) | - NEPA Compliance – Lead Agency  
- 404(b)(1) Compliance |
| Environmental Protection Agency | - None | - NEPA Compliance – Cooperating Agency  
- Clean Water Act – Section 404 oversight |
| Bureau of Land Management (1) | - Right-of-way for tailings pipelines  
- Right-of-way for water return pipelines  
- Right-of-way for Arizona Trail reroute  
- Right-of-way for reroute of SCIP 69kV line  
- Mineral material sale for saleable materials  
- Modification of mine plan of operations for tailings (Hackberry Gulch TSF only) | - NEPA Compliance – Cooperating Agency |
| San Carlos Irrigation Project (2) | - Powerline realignment easement approval | - NEPA Compliance - Cooperating Agency |
| Forest Service (3) | - None | - Coordination on Arizona Trail relocation |
| U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service | - None | - Threatened and Endangered Species Consultation (Section 7 Consultation). This could include a Biological Opinion. |
| Mine Safety and Health Administration | - Mine Identification Number  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STATE OF ARIZONA</strong></th>
<th><strong>Permits and Approvals</strong></th>
<th><strong>Miscellaneous Involvement and Responsibilities (Coordination and Consultation)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Department of Environment Quality | - Aquifer Protection Permit, including Closure Financial Assurance  
TSF Design Compliance with BADCT  
Temporary Cessation Plan  
Monitoring and Recordkeeping, and Facility Closure Plan  
- Water Quality Certification (Corps 404 permit)  
- Industrial AZDES Stormwater Permit | - Informal consultation on NEPA work |
| State Mine Inspector | - Reclamation Plan and Financial Assurance | - None |
| Department of Water Resources | - Dam Safety Permit, if needed  
- Water Rights, if needed | - None |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE OF ARIZONA</th>
<th>Permits and Approvals</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Involvement and Responsibilities (Coordination and Consultation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game and Fish Department</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Input related to wildlife resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)</td>
<td>Cultural (SHPO) clearance</td>
<td>- Section 106 consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands Department</td>
<td>State Land Sale (Ripsey Wash Area)</td>
<td>- Consultation with SHPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encroachment permit</td>
<td>- Informal consultation on NEPA work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bridge and Culvert Design Approvals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>- None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PINAL COUNTY</th>
<th>Permits and Approvals</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Involvement and Responsibilities (Coordination and Consultation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Control District</td>
<td>Industrial Air Quality Permit (Title V amendment)</td>
<td>- Informal consultation on NEPA work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space and Trails Advisory Commission</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>- Coordination on Arizona Trail Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
<td>- Informal consultation on NEPA work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td>County Road Relocation</td>
<td>- None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control District</td>
<td>- None (4)</td>
<td>- Informal consultation before construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Under the proposed action, the relocation of the Arizona National Scenic Trail (Arizona Trail) would involve BLM-administered lands. A portion of SCIP 69 kV electric transmission line, the tailings delivery and reclaim water pipelines would cross BLM-administered lands. The Hackberry Gulch TSF alternative would require a modification of the BLM mine plan of operations. The quarrying of rock material from federal mineral estate, regardless of surface ownership, requires an approved mineral material sale contract prior to removal (see 43 CFR 3600).
2. San Carlos Irrigation Project is administered by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs.
3. The U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has delegated its administrative responsibility for the Arizona Trail, which is a Congressionally-designated national scenic trail, to the Forest Service, as approximately 73% of the Arizona Trail is located on Forest Service administered lands. The Arizona Trail traverses the area proposed for the Ripsey Wash TSF, but there are no Forest Service administered lands associated with the proposed Ripsey Wash TSF. The Forest Service can coordinate with the Corps, other agencies, including the BLM and Pinal County, and Asarco on relocation options for the Arizona Trail should the Ripsey Wash TSF be selected as the preferred alternative.
4. Tailings are exempt from the requirement to obtain a floodplain use permit, pursuant to A.R.S. 48-3613(B)(3) and Article V, Section 5.6(2)(C) of the Pinal County floodplain management ordinance. However, pursuant to those same authorities, Asarco will provide the District with the opportunity to review and comment on the construction plans before construction commences.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

EPA has an independent reviewer role for all EIS documents published by federal agencies. In addition, based on its jurisdiction by law and special expertise associated with the Clean Water Act and Clean Air Act, EPA is serving as a cooperating agency with the Corps on the EIS for this project. As such, EPA has provided input into the EIS process.
3.1 CLEAN WATER ACT
The Clean Water Act instituted the following surface water programs:

- The Section 401 certification (see Section 8.3, Water Quality Certification);
- The Section 402 program regulating the point source and stormwater discharge of pollutants, including sediment;
- The Section 303 impaired waters program;
- The Section 404 permit program regulating the discharge of dredged or fill material; and,
- The Section 311 program regulating spills of oil and hazardous substances.

EPA established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program for regulating surface water quality. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 and subsequent amendments and re-authorizations principally initiated this program. In its amended and re-authorized form, this statute as a whole is now generally referred to as the Clean Water Act.

Section 402 of the Clean Water Act establishes the NPDES permit program. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is the permitting authority in the state of Arizona for the issuance of point source AZPDES (Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permits and the stormwater permitting program pursuant to Section 402 of the Clean Water Act.

Section 303 of the Clean Water Act requires the state to develop a list of water bodies that have one or more of the designated beneficial uses that are impaired by pollutants. Specifically, under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, Arizona was required to develop lists of impaired waters, which are waters for which technology-based regulations and other required controls were not stringent enough to meet water quality standards set by Arizona to protect public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water, and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In addition, to comply with the Clean Water Act, Arizona was required to establish priority rankings for waters on the impaired waters list and develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for these impaired waters. A TMDL is a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still safely meet water quality standards. These guidelines are used to derive individual technology-based AZPDES permit limits.

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act authorizes the Corps to issue permits “for the discharge of dredged or fill materials into navigable waters.” These permits are addressed in Section 13.1, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Responsibilities. The EPA is responsible for reviewing the consistency of any proposed 404 action with Section 404(b)(1) guidelines. In addition, pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA, the State of Arizona must provide certification that any Section 404 permit will not result in a violation of state surface water quality standards.

Section 311 of the Clean Water Act establishes requirements relating to discharges or spills of oil or hazardous substances. Discharges or spills of oil in “harmful quantities” are prohibited. The EPA has established a requirement for the preparation of a spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plan by facilities that handle substantial quantities of petroleum products.

3.2 CLEAN AIR ACT
In addition to water quality oversight, the EPA also maintains control over the air resources as outlined in the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act’s most basic goals are to protect public health and welfare. The EPA can comment on, but is not responsible for an air quality permit in this situation, which would be issued by Pinal County.
4.0 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is serving as a cooperating agency with the Corps on the EIS for this project. As such, the BLM has provided input into the EIS process. The BLM has to consider and disclose potential impacts to (1) project components involving BLM-administered resources and (2) BLM decision space, which may include non-BLM surface as connected actions.

Regarding the construction and operation of the proposed Ripsey Wash tailings storage facility, a segment of the designated tailings and reclaim water pipeline corridor would cross BLM-managed surface, and this activity would require a right-of-way (ROW) approval from the BLM.

Under the proposed action alternative, Asarco’s tailings storage facility would be located on private lands (once acquired from the state of Arizona). However, if any of the alternatives for the tailings storage facility was placed on BLM-managed surface, then the BLM, under the Mining Law of 1872, et seq., and Sections 302 and 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, would have responsibility for the review, approval or denial, and, “if approved”, the monitoring of related land use activities. In this case, Asarco would be required to submit a plan of operation to the BLM that meets the requirements of 43 CFR 3800.

Much of the area proposed for both the Ripsey and Hackberry Gulch TSFs is located as federal mineral estate. Under both the Ripsey Wash and Hackberry Gulch TSF alternatives, Asarco proposed to quarry rock from within the footprint of the proposed tailings starter embankments, as well as to quarry rock within and adjacent to the tailings facility for use in closure activities. The quarrying of common (non-mineralized) variety rock, even for onsite use, from the federal mineral estate, requires an approved mineral materials sales contract prior to commencing quarrying activities (See 36 CFR 3600). The BLM may not sell quarried rock materials at a price less than fair market value at the time of the sale. To initiate the sales process, Asarco must submit a request for the rock materials as described in 43 CFR §3602.11 and may be required to submit mining and reclamation plans as outlined in 43 CFR §3601.40.1 The sale of mineral materials requires a decision by the BLM authorizing the sale. This EIS document would serve as the NEPA compliance document for any proposed rock material sale.

5.0 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is serving as a cooperating agency with the Corps on the EIS for this project. As such, the BIA, through representatives from its San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP) has provided input into the EIS process.

SCIP operates and maintains a 69 kV electric transmission line, and a segment of that transmission line crosses through the area designated for the proposed Ripsey Wash tailings storage facility. This portion of the electric transmission line would have to be re-routed around the proposed facility. Asarco would coordinate with SCIP on this re-location, and a new transmission line easement would be required for the relocated routing.

1 At the Ripsey Wash TSF site, the area from which the saleable materials would be recovered ultimately would be covered with tailings materials, thus the BLM would not be expected to require a reclamation plan as part of the saleable materials contract for that site. If the Hackberry Gulch TSF alternative be selected, the BLM would probably require a reclamation plan as part of the saleable materials contract because the materials quarried from BLM administered lands would be outside the ultimate footprint of the TSF.
6.0  **FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has the administrative responsibility for the Endangered Species Act, as re-enacted in 1982. For this tailings storage facility Clean Water Act Section 404 permit, the Corps will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act regarding any federally listed threatened or endangered species that may be impacted by proposed operations. A biological assessment (BA) will be prepared for any federally listed threatened or endangered species, and this document will be submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in support of the consultation process. If adverse impacts to threatened or endangered species are projected, specific design measures to protect the affected species may need to be developed.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also administers the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

7.0  **ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

A copy of both the draft EIS and final EIS documents must be filed with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. This agency works in an advisory role to assist the Corps with compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. In addition, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) will consult with the Corps under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Office on any impacts to cultural resources. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation would be available to serve in an advisory role if requested by the SHPO. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation may also review state program activities and determine relative compliance to the previously mentioned National Historic Preservation Act.

8.0  **U.S. MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION**

Because the proposed tailings storage facility would become part of the Ray Mine, the health and safety aspects of the operation of that facility would be regulated by federal health and safety standards for mining operations. The U.S. Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) would make routine inspections of the operation and would be involved in education and safety training programs for Asarco personnel. Asarco would be responsible for providing MSHA with reports of accidents, injuries, occupational diseases, and related data. Specific programs for the education and training of Asarco employees are also under MSHA regulatory responsibilities.

9.0  **ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (Arizona DEQ) is responsible for protecting the environmental quality of the State of Arizona and has oversight responsibility for several permits that would be required for the proposed Ripsey Wash tailings storage facility. These include:

- Aquifer Protection Permit (includes facility closure plan);
- Water Quality Certification of Corps Section 404 permit; and,
- Stormwater Permit.

9.1  **AQUIFER PROTECTION PERMIT**

The Arizona DEQ requires an operator of a mine tailings storage facility to obtain an Aquifer Protection Permit (APP). This permit is required if the proposed facility has the possibility to discharge directly to
an aquifer or to the land surface or the vadose zone in such a manner that there is a reasonable probability that a pollutant could reach an underlying aquifer. The project proponent for an APP must demonstrate that Best Available Demonstrated Control Technology (BADCT) will be utilized to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants to the aquifer and that aquifer quality standards will not be exceeded at the point of compliance (or that existing water quality will not worsen if standards are already exceeded at the point of compliance at the time of permit issuance). The APP also requires that the project proponent has the financial and technical capabilities to comply with the permit.

9.2 FACILITY CLOSURE PLAN

The Arizona DEQ requires a closure plan (or strategy) for a tailings storage facility and its supporting infrastructure. The Arizona DEQ must approve the closure plan (or strategy) prior to the issuance of an APP for the facility.

9.3 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION

The Arizona DEQ is responsible for issuing a Section 401 water quality certification to ensure federally permitted or licensed activities do not cause a violation of state water quality standards when that activity may result in a discharge to surface waters regulated by the Clean Water Act. In the case of the proposed Ripsey Wash tailings storage facility, the federal permit would be a Section 404 permit from the Corps.

9.4 STORMWATER PERMIT

Industrial activities in Arizona with stormwater discharges are required to obtain an Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) 402 permit from the Arizona DEQ.

A stormwater permit is also required in Arizona from a construction operation that is greater than 1 acre in size. An Arizona mining entity may secure coverage for such construction activities under the construction general permit or the mining multi-sector general permit.

10.0 ARIZONA STATE MINE INSPECTOR

The Arizona State Mine Inspector requires a reclamation plan for mining activities with surface disturbances on private lands greater than five acres. Reclamation plans must identify the proposed post-project land use and the measures necessary to achieve that use. The Arizona State Mine Inspector also requires a financial assurance based on the actual estimated costs of reclamation. Financial assurances can be provided in any one of several forms, including surety bond, certificate of deposit, cash deposit, and/or corporate guarantee.

11.0 ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

The Arizona Department of Water Resources (Arizona DWR) administers four categories of water supplies available in Arizona:

1. Colorado River water (administered under the Central Arizona Project, also known as CAP);
2. Surface water from lakes, rivers, stream and springs as well as storage reservoirs and delivery systems;
3. Groundwater from wells; and,
4. Reclaimed water or effluent water.
The Department of Interior oversees deliveries of Central Arizona Project water; Arizona DWR acts to protect Arizona’s allocation of Colorado River Water but distribution of this water is under federal oversight.

Surface water is administered under the doctrine of prior appropriation, also known as “first in time, first in right”, meaning the person who first puts the water to a beneficial use acquires a right that is better than later appropriators of the water.

Groundwater is subject to the beneficial use doctrine. In 1980, the Arizona Legislature enacted the Groundwater Management Act to control severe groundwater depletion and to provide the means for allocating limited groundwater resources to meet Arizona water needs. Five active management areas were created near populated areas in the state, in addition to seven planning areas. The proposed Ripsey Wash and/or Hackberry Gulch project sites are not located within an active management area.

Asarco’s right to use Gila River water is governed by the Globe Equity Decree. The United States District Court for the District of Arizona entered a decree in United States v. Gila Valley Irrigation District, Globe Equity No. 59 (Decree) on June 29, 1935 embodying a settlement reached among numerous claimants to water in the Gila River. The Decree controls the use of the mainstem of the Gila River within its designated reach.

Article IX of the Decree recognizes the right of ASARCO, as a successor in to Kennecott Copper Corporation, to divert up to 16,221 acre-feet per year of the natural flow of the Gila River for industrial, municipal, domestic and related purposes at a rate not to exceed 10,000 gallons per minute. This water is to be diverted by means of wells located in ASARCO’s Hayden well field. Article IX authorizes Asarco to divert its entitlement in disregard of the senior water rights of the United States held for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community and the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District. The lands within the Gila River Indian Reservation and the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District entitled to be irrigated pursuant to the Decree are served by the San Carlos Irrigation Project, a federal reclamation project.

12.0 ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

The Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) must be consulted when projects are subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. This act requires that all federal agencies take into account the effect of their actions on historic properties. The Arizona State Historic Preservation Act should be consulted to determine if the site has been surveyed, if there are identified historic resources on site, and if the property is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. If the project will adversely affect property that meets the National Historic Register criteria, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office will recommend ways to avoid or mitigate adverse effects.

13.0 PINAL COUNTY

With regards to Asarco’s proposed plans for the tailings storage facility, Pinal County has regulatory requirements for air quality, open space and county roads. However, mining operations greater than 5 acres in size are exempt from county zoning requirements pursuant to A.R.S. 11-811(C)(2) and Section 2.05.050 of the Pinal County Development Services Code. Pinal County also has an advisory and coordination role with regards to the Arizona National Scenic Trail (Arizona Trail).
13.1  AIR QUALITY CONTROL DISTRICT

The Pinal County Air Quality Control District has permit review and approval authority for any operation of a source, such as an existing mining operation, that produces one ton or more of regulated pollutants on a continuous basis for a full year. Pinal County has an air quality program approval and/or delegation from the EPA to administer several programs under the Clean Air Act, including authority to issue major and minor New Source Review (NSR) permits, issue Title V permits, and administer EPA’s New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) and Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards.

13.2  OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS ADVISORY COMMISSION

The Pinal County Board of Supervisors have established an Open Space and Trails Advisory Commission that acts as a recommending body to the Supervisors on issues related to open space, trails and regional parks. This will include any action on the possible relocation or realignment of the Arizona Trail in the Ripsey Wash area.

13.3  PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

The Pinal County Public Works Department is responsible for county road design, construction, and maintenance. This agency must review and approve the design for any re-routing of the Florence-Kelvin highway, which would be necessary if Asarco is allowed to construct and operate the proposed Ripsey Wash tailings storage facility. The Pinal County Public Works Department also is responsible for maintenance on the Florence-Kelvin highway.

13.4  FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

The Pinal County Flood Control District works in coordination with the Pinal County Public Works Department to minimize flood and erosion hazards within the county. The Flood Control District provides services to the public through:

- Floodplain management and permitting;
- Drainage review and complaint investigation;
- Flood and storm monitoring and data collection;
- Studies and capital improvement projects;
- Public outreach and education; and,
- Stormwater management.

Tailings are exempt from the requirement to obtain a floodplain use permit, pursuant to A.R.S. 48-3613(B)(3) and Article V, Section 5.6(2)(C) of the Pinal County floodplain management ordinance.