



HAILE GOLD MINE





## Romarco Minerals, Inc.



- A Canadian company
- An exploration and development stage gold company
- Trades on the Toronto Stock exchange (TSX: R)
- All executive management for Romarco and Haile reside in SC



## Haile Gold Mine, Inc.



- A wholly owned subsidiary of Romarco Minerals, Inc.
- Currently in post closure monitoring
- Actively exploring
- Pursuing permitting.

What we want to do is mine gold



# Industry Perspective on Permitting







## Haile Gold Mine History



- First discovery by Colonel Benjamin Haile
- Beginning with placer mining “panning” in 1827
- Mining continued with trenching, underground and open pit methods through the early 1990’s



## Haile Gold Mine 1827 - current

DR. CARL ADOLPH THIES SR.



1890's - 1900's - Dr. Thies. Circa 1904

- HGM mined on and off for nearly 200 years
- Dr. Adolf Thies introduced the barrel chlorination process to Haile in 1887
- Previous mining operations at Haile used mercury, chlorination and open-air cyanide heap leaching into the early 90's





# 2010 Haile Aerial





# Industry Perspective on Permitting

## Haile's Approach to permitting

- Understand agency concerns
- Provide sound designs and studies for permitting
- Assure all agencies have information needed
  - Series of technical briefings with agencies (Federal and State) & contractor on issues of interest
- Work together on subjects for future technical briefings





# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- 2007 – (October)
  - Romarco acquires the site and starts exploration program
  - Meet with DHEC
- 2008
  - Continued to meet with DHEC
  - Initiated baseline programs
- 2009
  - Met with the Corps of Engineers in Charleston
    - Project was assigned to Conway Office
- 2010
  - Filed application with DHEC – Mining
  - Filed (first) application with Corps of Engineers/DHEC 401



# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- Conduct meetings and host site tours
  - SC DHEC
  - Corps of Engineers
  - State Historic Preservation Office
  - Catawba Indian Nation
  - Department of Natural Resources
  - US Fish and Wildlife
  - National Marine Fisheries
  - Town of Kershaw
  - Lancaster County
  - Environmental Community
  - Public
    - Town Hall meetings



# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- Town of Kershaw and Lancaster County
  - Zoning
  - Road closures
  - Building Permits
  - SARA reporting
  - Blasting
  - Noise Ordinance





# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- SC Department of Health and Environmental Control
  - Bureau of Land and Water Management
    - Mining Permit
  - Bureau of Water
    - 401 Water Quality Certification
    - 402 NPDES discharge permit
    - Stormwater permit for construction activity
    - Stormwater permit for industrial activity
    - Dam Safety
  - Bureau of Air Quality
    - Air Permit
    - Demolition Permits



# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- US Army Corps of Engineers
  - Cooperating Agencies
    - EPA
    - DHEC
    - Catawba Indian Nation
  
- Timeline
  - Application date January 2011
  - EIS Decision July 2011
  - Third Party Contractor selected September 2011
  - Public Notice – September 2011
  - Scoping Meeting October 2011
  - Draft EIS Preparation - ongoing



# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- Environmental Community and the Public
  - Numerous meetings and site tours
  - Three Town Hall meetings with the local community







# Industry Perspective on Permitting





# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- The earlier an EIS is determined to be required for the project the better for industry.
- Permitting overlaps between State and Federal should be avoided. Industry needs a clear understanding who has authority over a given issue.
- Where the Federal program has only implied or no authority over a given issue, that issue should defer to the State regulatory programs with explicit authority over that issue.





# Industry Perspective on Permitting

- State regulatory programs familiar with mining should want to AND should be included in the EIS process as a cooperating agency:
  - Enables State and Federal programs to coordinate regulatory coverage to eliminate unnecessary permitting overlaps.
  - Increases the likelihood of proper communication between regulatory programs and the public. Public will have a better understanding which program has authority of a given issue.
  - Increases the public's confidence in the regulatory process if they understand the State and Federal are working together in the EIS process.