

Drury, Andrew (EGLE)

From: Nutini, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nutini@lundinmining.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2019 8:58 AM
To: Drury, Andrew (EGLE)
Cc: Scanlan, Joseph (EGLE); Lancaster, Edward (EGLE); Carlson, Nicholas (EGLE); Smith, Cindy (EGLE); Kohl, Steven; 'Lydia Salmon'; Bertucci, David; Carlson, Karen; Brian Leahy; Zeidler, Amanda
Subject: RE: Eagle Mine PTI applications 50-06D and 405-08B
Attachments: [Response AQD Questions PTI 50 06D.pdf](#)

Mr. Drury –

Please find the attached response to your questions. Please let either me or Brian know if you have additional questions.

Thanks,
Jen

Jennifer Nutini, P.E.

Eagle Mine

Direct: (906) 339-7029

Mobile: (906) 204-9867

ZERO HARM SAFER Every Day!

From: Drury, Andrew (EGLE) <DRURYA@michigan.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 11:51 AM
To: Nutini, Jennifer <Jennifer.Nutini@lundinmining.com>; Brian Leahy <BLEahy@barr.com>
Cc: Scanlan, Joseph (EGLE) <ScanlanJ@michigan.gov>; Lancaster, Edward (EGLE) <LANCASTERE1@michigan.gov>; Carlson, Nicholas (EGLE) <CarlsonN1@michigan.gov>; Smith, Cindy (EGLE) <SMITHC17@michigan.gov>
Subject: Eagle Mine PTI applications 50-06D and 405-08B

Ms. Nutini and Mr. Leahy,

We are reviewing the Eagle Mine air permit applications and have a few questions for you:

1. For the request to change the ore truck limit from a 12-month rolling limit to a calendar year limit, please discuss how this change fits in with guidance on practical enforceability.
2. For application 50-06B, do the vehicle travel emission calculations address hauling development rock from the TDRSA to the backfill plant? Development rock is not listed in the materials hauled. I think this may be addressed through the aggregate calculations assuming that all rock used in the backfill plant would be aggregate, rather than development rock, since the travel distance for aggregate appears to be longer than the travel distance for development rock.
3. The aggregate building emissions in the modeling for application 50-06B appear to be lower than the emissions in the modeling for the previous permit review, and the aggregate throughput also appears to be lower. Please address these apparent differences.
4. Similar to item 3, the COSA building emissions appear to be lower in application 50-06B than in the previous review. Please address this apparent difference.

5. For application 50-06B, the calculations assume 440,920 tons per year of development rock is screened, but only 286,298 tons per year of development rock are used in the backfill plant. Please address this difference.
6. For application 50-06B, it appears that the emissions for vehicle travel from the mine gate to the pavement edge are lower than in the previous permit review. Please address this apparent difference.

Please provide this information by September 4, if possible.

Note, we may have more questions as our review progresses.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Andrew Drury, Senior Engineer Specialist
General Manufacturing/Chemical Process Unit, Permit Section
Air Quality Division
Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy
517-284-6792 | drurya@michigan.gov
Follow Us | [Michigan.gov/AIR](https://www.michigan.gov/AIR)