Message

From: Brush, Jason [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ADE1A32824404ED5A333DCD77F2DFC4A-JBRUSH]
Sent: 4/20/2017 5:35:53 PM
To: Goforth, Kathleen [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=0821ccf0ea9e4c18a3d2a583158b713e-KGOFORTH]; Moutoux, Nicole [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=574b3a85014d46d3965b59700a04a55e-NMOUTOUX]; Torres, Tomas [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=8b2f42bb7a684e199190092e3a2e7520-TTORRES]; Johnson, Kathleen [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=d36de0cd8ee14ff6a6aa2f1df9b159f6-KJOHNS05]
CC: Miller, Clay [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=4de9218d19f543219815da51f7685c31-CMille03]; Eisenberg, Mindy [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=cfb4c26bb6f44c7db69f9884628b3ef9-Eisenberg, Mindy]; Campbell, Rich [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=e27d0a99a96942119ff85ae2a6132062-RCAMPBEL]; Downing, Donna [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=d853e50d3a2b489daf2cc498c052e3d6-DDowning]
Subject: FW: water quality correspondence Re: Rosemont Mine
Attachments: ADEQ ltr to EPA. june12.2015.pdf; EPA ltr to Corps regarding other water quality aspects in light of state....pdf

Importance: High

Reiterating for transmittal to OFA in the context of the Ducey letter:

1. The Corps has subsequently confirmed that resolution of water quality issues to EPA's satisfaction is not prerequisite to a permit decision.

2. Jared's letter of April 14, 2015 (and it's attached April 7, 2014 comments from WDD Jane Diamond) have no substantive legal impact on the state's authorities, including the completed 401 cert. These letters merely require the Corps to consider EPA's views in addition to those of the state in the Corps' water quality findings for their permit decision.

3. EPA's identification of "other water quality aspects" was appropriate because the state's action was geographically conscribed (by state law) to an area narrower than shown in the EIS to have significant water quality impacts. This central issue of scope has never represented a disagreement with the state.