Martiz,

Thanks for that.

Guys – with a pond that is 1m high; has 60cm of gravel on top; leaves 40cm of capacity. It looks like the 3 ponds are 5cm, 5cm and 7cm low respectively (to be confirmed). That is 12.5% and 18% minimum. We do have to be more accurate than that.

We're all aware of the issue at Roberts Bay 5M liter containment area. The last thing we want or need was to be short somewhere else.

Let's get the 5M liter tank berm at Roberts Bay right on the money. We're better off a little high than a little low.

As the volumes for these ponds are not a defined specific volume; we should leave them as they sit.

EPCM will take the action to update the turnover package with volumes.

Thanks,

Kevin

From: Rykaart, Maritz [mailto:mrykaart@srk.com]
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2011 12:17 PM
To: Nick Stoneberger; Wade, Lowell; Katsky Venter
Cc: Kurylo, John; Mcgregor, Murray; Bay, Hope; Kevin Oakes; Chris Petrovic; Kevin Mather; Doug Fielding; Jerry Graham
Subject: RE: Land farm

Nick

The words "sloppy construction" are mine and not that of Lowell, and you are correct that it was a poor choice of words. As was mentioned in the same communication, although not in 100% accordance with IFC lines and grades the differences are not unreasonable for a structure of this kind. Our recommendation to the client would be that they accept the structure as is, but if they would like to increase capacity we would recommend trimming the ramps and backfill to design grade but not to raise the liner as the cost benefit would not be warranted.

I will be sure to rectify my poor choice of words in my communication to the Owner and will copy you on that.

Please accept my apologies for any harm or embarrassment that this has caused.

Regards
Maritz

Maritz Rykaart *Ph.D., P.Eng.*
Principal Consultant

srk consulting

SRK Consulting (Canada) Inc.
Suite 2200, 1066 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, V6E 3X2, Canada
Tel: +1-604-681-4196; **Fax**: +1-604-687-5532
Mobile:+ 604-928-1552; **Direct**: +1-604-601-8426
Email: mrykaart@srk.com

www.srk.com

From: Nick Stoneberger [mailto:nicks@nunalogistics.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2011 11:09 AM
To: Wade, Lowell; Katsky Venter
Cc: Rykaart, Maritz; Kurylo, John; Mcgregor, Murray; Bay, Hope; Kevin Oakes; Chris Petrovic
Subject: RE: Land farm

Lowell,

Your onsite personnel have inspected and signed off on every stage of Land Farm construction. We have submitted these signoffs as well as the as-built drawings as part of the turnover package. I resent the fact that there is an insinuation that part of the containment issue arises from "sloppy construction" and expect that you will retract that statement.

Regards,

Nick Stoneberger
Site Superintendent
Hope Bay Mining Project
T: +1 604 998 5400 x 87541
C: +1 780 504 9472

NUNA CONTRACTING LIMITED
9839 - 31 Avenue, Edmonton, AB, T6N 1C5
nicks@nunalogistics.com
www.nunalogistics.com

From: Wade, Lowell [mailto:lwade@srk.com]
Sent: September-14-11 10:30 AM
To: Katsky Venter
Cc: Rykaart, Maritz; Kurylo, John; Mcgregor, Murray; Bay, Hope
Subject: RE: Land farm

Hi Katsky,

Your email prompted us to go back and recheck everything as we were equally confused! So here is what we concluded:

1. The big pond is definitely the SOIL pond.
2. The Design and As-built volumes are presented on the attached Figure. On this figure we have three numbers:
    a. Design containment volume at Elevation 56.0 m [Water Pond], 56.5 m [Snow Pond], and 56.8 m [Soil Pond] – this is what the design capacity should be if the pond was constructed perfectly with zero variance.
    b. Design containment volume at Elevation 55.93 m [Water Pond], 56.45 m [Snow Pond], and 56.75 m [Soil Pond] – this is the design capacity due to the liner having not being constructed perfectly to the design height, but if all else was constructed perfectly this would have been the containment volume.
    c. As-built containment volume at Elevation 55.93 m [Water Pond], 56.45 m [Snow Pond], and 56.75 m [Soil Pond] – this is the ACTUAL current available capacity of the pond based on what was built. The

reason this number is lower than the design is threefold:

i. The liner is slightly lower than design, but certainly within acceptable tolerance for construction of a structure of this kind.
ii. The fill over the liner is greater than the design, and the reason is sloppy construction, but again not unreasonable.
iii. The ramp is larger than the design, and the reason is sloppy construction, but again not unreasonable.

3. All of the above capacities are the does not take into consideration pore space of the gravel overliner. That volume is so small that we ignore it as a general rule of practice.
4. We can't explain why the numbers quoted here are slightly different than the as-built numbers provided by Nuna. We used raw data supplied by Nuna to create a model to calculate the numbers presented. We would have to get Nuna survey and our engineers to compare their models to sort this out.

We also went back to the 2010 Doris North Land Farm Management and Monitoring Plan and there the pond volumes are quoted as being higher than shown. That is an error in the Management Plan. Likewise, the previous 3D figure of the ponds which you has which listed larger volumes were wrong.

As a final note you should know that the size of the three ponds was set arbitrarily. It was governed by the size of the available piece of ground at the time. We therefore designed the largest possible series of ponds at that location.

I trust that clarifies your confusion (and ours for that matter!), but if you have any further questions please don't hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,
Lowell

From: Katsky Venter [mailto:Katsky.Venter@Newmont.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2011 3:04 PM
To: Wade, Lowell
Subject: FW: Land farm

Hey Lowell,

Can you help me with this? Everything gets too confusing when I talk to people here…

Thanks,
Katsky
PS – in the 2010 SRK Landfarm management plan the big pond was for soil….

From: Katsky Venter
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2011 1:43 PM
To: Mcgregor, Murray
Subject: FW: Land farm

From: Katsky Venter
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 6:15 PM
To: Doug Fielding
Cc: Angela Holzapfel
Subject: FW: Land farm

Hi Doug,

So apparently the below volumes in the last column of the table are the as built capacities of the pond (!). This doesn't make sense, but I have gone over it at least 10 times with the Nuna General Superintendent and he assures me they are. These capacities are half of what I was expecting based on the SRK drawing attached.

Apparently the ponds were exactly built to spec., so where is the error? Also, we really need to confirm which pond is which, even SRK swaps them around in their drawings. Angela is positive that the large pond is for soil, and that makes the most sense to me, but this whole thing is a jumble.

Doug, help!

Thanks,
Katsky

From: Katsky Venter
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 4:44 PM
To: 'Mike Price'; Bradford Watkin
Cc: Doug Fielding; Kevin Oakes; Doug Haverland
Subject: RE: Land farm

Hi Mike,

Thanks for sending these, but can I get some help understanding them and making sure I am getting the practical volumes of material the ponds will hold?

What capacity do we have for water in each of the water ponds and for soil in the soil pond? Does the crush include only the crush that is below the low point in the liner? Does it include the ramp? Are you expanding the ramp (I heard a rumor of this)? Also, for the water ponds, does the water capacity include the knowledge that crush is porous?

One more thing, somewhere things got turned around. Apparently the largest pond should be the soil pond. Can you verify this on the SRK construction drawings and make the changes on your as builts?

Thanks,
Katsky

From: Mike Price [mailto:mikepr@nunalogistics.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 4:23 PM
To: Katsky Venter; Bradford Watkin
Cc: Doug Fielding; Kevin Oakes; Doug Haverland
Subject: RE: Land farm

Katsky,

Below are the asbuilt volumes for the land farm ponds

Land Farm	Low Pt on Lined Crest	Liner Capacity m^3	Liner Capacity with crush surfacing m^3
Soil Pond	55.94	556	191
Snow Pond	56.45	567	195
Water Pond	56.72	913	300

* Capacity within crushed surface from the low point of the liner crest

Mike

From: Katsky Venter [mailto:Katsky.Venter@Newmont.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 8:57 AM
To: Bradford Watkin
Cc: Doug Fielding; Mike Price; Kevin Oakes; Doug Haverland
Subject: RE: Land farm

Hi Guys,

This is just a reminder needing the as-built volumes for these ponds to commission the Land Farm.

Thanks,
Katsky

From: Katsky Venter
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2011 10:55 AM
To: 'Bradford Watkin'
Cc: Doug Fielding; Mike Price; Kevin Oakes; Doug Haverland
Subject: RE: Land farm

Thank you Brad.

From: Bradford Watkin [mailto:bradfordw@hopebayminingproject.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2011 10:52 AM
To: Katsky Venter
Cc: Doug Fielding; Mike Price; Kevin Oakes; Doug Haverland
Subject: RE: Land farm

Hi Katsky, please see attached As-Built drawings. If you would like any specific drawing unmarked please forward me the drawing number and I will forward it to you.
As stated Mike Price (mikep@nunalogistics.com) will obtain As-Built pond containment volumes after he consults with our survey dept.

Regards Brad

Bradford W. Watkin
Quality Assurance/Quality Control Manager
Hope Bay Mining Project
T: 604-998-5400 Ext. 87549
C: 780-238-5345

NUNA LOGISTICS LIMITED
9839 - 31 Avenue, Edmonton, AB, T6N 1C5
bradfordw@hopebayminingproject.com
www.nunalogistics.com

From: Katsky Venter [mailto:Katsky.Venter@Newmont.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2011 10:31 AM

To: Bradford Watkin
Cc: Doug Fielding
Subject: Land farm

Hi Brad,

The attached document has the drawings of the land farm according to the Land Farm management plan. As you can see, the access road and ramps to the facility are on the east side (not the west).

I understand that this access was actually built on the west side. I just need an electronic drawing that shows this that I can include in the SOP for this facility. Otherwise there will be confusion over which pond is which.

Can you please send me something as soon as possible? I will also await the as built volumes. These volumes should be calculated as:

[liner volume (based on lowest point of wall)] – [overliner crush material] – [access ramp vlumes insite the ponds and below the liner]

Thanks,
Katsky

NEWMONT
NORTH AMERICA

Katsky Venter
ESR Site Manager

T 604.998.5400 ext. 87177

Hope Bay Mining Ltd.
#300-889 Harbourside Dr.
North Vancouver, BC
V7P 3S1
www.newmont.com

.
==========

==========

.

==========

==========

.
==========
The content of this message may contain the private views and opinions of the sender and does not constitute a formal view and/or opinion of the company unless specifically stated.

The contents of this email and any attachments may contain confidential and/or proprietary information, and is intended only for the person/entity to whom it was originally addressed. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete this message and any attachments from your system.

Please refer to http://www.newmont.com/en/disclaimer for other language versions of this disclaimer.
==========