March 28, 2012

Mr. Ken Marcy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
12928 SW 276th Street
Vashon, WA 98070

RE: Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment Report for the Iola Mine, Idaho County, Idaho

Dear Mr. Marcy:

Attached is an Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment (APA) for the Iola Mine near Orogrande, Idaho. The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) did not visit this property due to lack of contaminant sources and receptors at this site.

A site inspection was conducted by the Idaho Geological Survey (IGS) in 1999. IGS observed the following.

This site consists of one collapsed adit that has a minor seep discharging onto the dump, creating a large swampy area on the dump surface. No water was observed seeping from the dump. The dump is 30 feet long, 15 feet wide, and 10 feet thick. The small stream just south of the adit scarcely touches the dump. The disturbed area covers less than 0.5 acre.

IGS did not collect a water sample for analysis from the site. IGS collected a water sample from a tributary of the Crooked River just west of the Iola adit. The water sample exceeded the secondary MCL and the Aquatic Life Chronic standard for aluminum and cadmium in the dissolved metals screen. Iron exceeded the secondary MCL in the total recoverable metals screen.

IGS reported:

An examination of other water samples taken from mines in the same geology and vicinity show similar elevated metals concentrations. These values are not remarkable and it is unlikely any human health risks or ecological health risks are associated with this area.
The site inspection conducted by IGS provided direct observations that confirmed sources of contaminants of concern including hazardous materials and petroleum products were not present in quantities that pose a threat to human health or the environment. No contaminants or hazardous substances remain on the site. No surface water, ground water or airborne pathways were detected. No occupied homes or cabins exist on the.

As a result of the above information, DEQ recommends the property status of the Iola Mine site be designated as No Remedial Action Planned (NRAP).

A link to DEQ’s Iola Mine APA can also be found on DEQ’s Mining Preliminary Assessment Web page at:


If you have any questions about this site, the report, or DEQ’s recommendations, please do not hesitate to call me at (208) 373-0563.

Respectfully,

Tina Elayer
Mine Waste Specialist

attachment

cc: Clint Hughes ~ USFS
    Scott Sanner – BLM
    Iola Mine File
This is an Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment (APA) for the Iola Mine near Orogrande, Idaho. This document provides the rationale for the determination of No Remedial Action Planned (NRAP) and that no additional analysis or site investigation is necessary for the Iola Mine. The information to produce this document was taken from the 2003 Idaho Geological Survey (IGS) report. A map generated during desktop research is attached.

Preparer: Daniel D. Stewart  
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality  
300 W. Main  
Grangeville, ID 83530  
(208) 983-0808  
daniel.stewart@deq.idaho.gov

Date: 3/21/12

Site Name: Iola Mine

Site Owner: U.S. Forest Service

Address: c/o Mr. Clint Hughes  
Nez Perce National Forest  
104 Airport Road  
Grangeville, ID 83530

Site Location: From IGS 2003:
Access is via County Road 233 approximately 11.2 miles south from the junction with State Highway 14. Opposite the Orogrande-Frisco Mine, an old road fords Crooked River to the east. The caved adit is approximately 0.6 mile east on this old road on land administered by the Forest Service.

Township 27 North, Range 7 East, Section 1

Latitude: 45.70639°N  Longitude: -115.53361°W

Describe the release (or potential release) and its probable nature:

DEQ did not visit this property due to lack of contaminant sources and receptors at the Iola Mine site.
The Iola Mine was investigated by IGS on July 3, 1999. IGS reported one collapsed adit with a minor seep and a swampy dump. Although a sample was taken from a tributary of Crooked River, no water samples were collected on site.

The IGS report contained no information indicating any environmental concerns were observed or documented. This would indicate no potential releases of heavy metals by airborne means or surface and ground water existed which would cause any human health risks or ecological health risks. Additionally, potential discharges of other deleterious materials, such as petroleum products and ore processing chemicals would have been investigated.

**Part 1 - Superfund Eligibility Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If all answers are “no” go on to Part 2, otherwise proceed to Part 3.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the site currently in CERCLIS or an “alias” of another site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the site being addressed by some other remedial program (Federal, State, or Tribal)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the hazardous substances that may be released from the site regulated under a statutory exclusion (e.g., petroleum, natural gas, natural gas liquids, synthetic gas usable for fuel, normal application of fertilizer, release located in a workplace, naturally occurring, or regulated by the NRC, UMTRCA, or OSHA)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the hazardous substances that may be released from the site excluded by policy considerations (i.e., deferred to RCRA corrective action)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there sufficient documentation to demonstrate that there is no potential for a release that constitutes risk to human or ecological receptors? (e.g., comprehensive remedial investigation equivalent data showing no release above ARARs, completed removal action, documentation showing that no hazardous substance releases have occurred, or an EPA approved risk assessment completed)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please explain all “yes” answer(s):**

The site inspection conducted by IGS provided direct observations that confirmed sources of contaminants of concern including hazardous materials and petroleum products were not present in quantities that pose a threat to human health or the environment. No contaminants or hazardous substances remain on the site. No surface water, ground water or airborne pathways were detected. No occupied homes or cabins exist on the claim.
Part 2 - Initial Site Evaluation

For Part 2, if information is not available to make a “yes” or “no” response, further investigation may be needed. In these cases, determine whether an APA is appropriate. Exhibit 1 parallels the questions in Part 2. Use Exhibit 1 to make decisions in Part 3.

If the answer is “no” to any of questions 1, 2, or 3, proceed directly to Part 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the answers to questions 1, 2, and 3 above were all “yes” then answer the questions below before proceeding to Part 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

It is unlikely any human health risks or ecological health risks are associated with this mine site. No surface water, ground water or airborne pathways were reported by IGS. No occupied homes or cabins exist on the claim. A water sample from a tributary of Crooked River near the site showed elevated levels of aluminum and cadmium. The adit had a minor seep which discharged into the waste dump. No seepage came from the waste dump. There is no mention of any drinking water sources and no homes are within the drainage or close proximity.

During the site assessment, DEQ used references from several different documents including U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) maps, county tax rolls, and historical reports that have spelled numerous claim names, town sites, and/or geographic features differently from one and another. DEQ’s use of the different spellings is to remain in context with the reference used for each given section of text or written in this report.
Exhibit 1 – Site Assessment Decision Guidelines for a Site

Exhibit 1 identifies different types of site information and provides some possible recommendations for further site assessment activities based on that information. The assessor should use Exhibit 1 in determining the need for further action at the site, based on the answers to the questions in Part 2. Please use your professional judgment when evaluating a site. Your judgment may be different from the general recommendations for a site given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspected/Documented Site Conditions</th>
<th>APA</th>
<th>Full PA</th>
<th>PA/SI</th>
<th>SI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Releases or potential to release are not documented at the site. <strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uncontained sources with CERCLA-eligible substances have not been documented as being present on the site. (i.e., they do exist at site) <strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On-site, adjacent, or nearby receptors are not present. <strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is no documentation or observations made leading to the conclusion that a sensitive receptor is present or may have been exposed (e.g., drinking water system user inside four mile TDL). <strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>Option 1: APA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is documentation that a sensitive receptor has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site. <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>Option 2: Full PA or PA/SI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is an apparent release at the site with no documentation of targets, but there are targets on site or immediately adjacent to the site. <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>Option 1: APA SI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2: PA/SI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is an apparent release and no documented on-site targets and no documented targets immediately adjacent to the site, but there are nearby targets. Nearby targets are those targets that are located within one mile of the site and have a relatively high likelihood of exposure to a hazardous substance migration from the site. <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There are: no indications of a hazardous substance release; uncontained sources containing CERCLA hazardous substances; but there is a potential to release with targets present on site or in proximity to the site. <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3 - DEQ Site Assessment Decision

When completing Part 3, use Part 2 and Exhibit 1 to select the appropriate decision. For example, if the answer to question 1 in Part 2 was “no,” then an APA may be performed and the “NRAP” box below should be checked. Additionally, if the answer to question 4 in Part 2 is “yes,” then you have two options (as indicated in Exhibit 1): Option 1 -- conduct an APA and check the “Lower Priority SI” or “Higher Priority SI” box below; or Option 2 -- proceed with a combined PA/SI assessment.

Check the box that applies based on the conclusions of the APA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Remedial Action Planned (NRAP)</th>
<th>Defer to NRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Higher Priority SI</td>
<td>Refer to Removal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Priority SI</td>
<td>Site is being addressed as part of another CERCLIS site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defer to RCRA Subtitle C</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEQ Reviewer:

Daniel D. Stewart

[Signature]

3/27/12 Date

Please Explain the Rationale for Your Decision:

The 2003 IGS report indicated no areas of concern were found. No occupied homes or cabins exist on the site, thus no pathways exist relative to human health risks or environmental risks. No drinking water sources or residences exist in the drainage. IGS did not indicate any hazardous or deleterious materials on site. This site is not easily accessible as the road to the mine has been reclaimed.

Although reference sample E7039903 was taken just west of the Iola adit from a tributary of Crooked River, no water samples were collected from this site. Analysis concentrations were not remarkable. Elevated metals concentrations in highly mineralized areas are typical for this geology.

As a result of the information contained in this APA, DEQ recommends the property status of the Iola Mine be designated as No Remedial Action Planned (NRAP).
Notes:

The italicized text below was taken directly from the 2003 IGS report.

**Site Description:** This site consists of one collapsed adit that has a minor seep discharging onto the dump, creating a large swampy area on the dump surface. No water was observed seeping from the dump. The dump is 30 feet long, 15 feet wide, and 10 feet thick. The small stream just south of the adit scarcely touches the dump. The disturbed area covers less than 0.5 acre.

**Geologic Features:** The adit is in Late Cretaceous biotite granodiorite near a north-trending fault that intersects the Orogrande shear zone (Lewis and others, 1990, 1993). The Iola Mine explores quartz veins in the country rock.

**Water Sample:** No water samples were collected from this site, although reference sample E7039903 was taken just west of the Iola adit from a tributary of Crooked River.

Reference sample E7039903 exceeds the Secondary MCL and the Aquatic Life Chronic standard for aluminum and the Aquatic Life Chronic standard for cadmium in the dissolved metals screen. In the total recoverable metals screen, iron exceeds the Secondary MCL.

An examination of other water samples taken from mines in the same geology and vicinity show similar elevated metals concentrations. These values are not remarkable and it is unlikely any human health risks or ecological health risks are associated with this area.

**History:** The Iola Mine produced a small amount of ore between 1910 and 1915.

**Structures:** There are no structures at this site.

**Safety:** There are no safety hazards at this site.
References:


Attachment:
Map
Topographic Overview Map of the Iola Mine Location
(Map Source: National Geographic Topographic Software).