

Meeting #40  
January 20, 2016  
**MEETING SUMMARY**

**Meeting Attendees**

*Community Working Group members present:*

Rick Cartier – Superior Chamber of Commerce alternate  
Pam Bennett – Queen Valley Community Liaison  
Bruce Wittig – Queen Valley Water Board  
JoAnn Besich – Superior Optimist Club  
Pamela Rabago – Superior Chamber of Commerce  
George Martin – JF Ranch  
Lynn Martin – JF Ranch  
Mark Siegwarth – Boyce Thompson Arboretum  
Hank Gutierrez - Superior Copper Alliance  
Nancy Vogler – LOST Trail  
Bill Vogler – Superior Copper Alliance  
Fred Gaudet – Arizona Trail Association  
Anthony Huerta – Town of Superior  
Cecil Fendley – Queen Valley Water Board  
Arlynn Godinez - Superior Unified School District  
Tiffany Rowell – Superior resident

*Community Working Group members not present:*

Evelyn Vargas – Cobre Valley Regional Medical Center  
Roy Chavez - Concerned Citizens and Retired Miners  
Jeff Bunkelmann – Central Arizona College

*Resolution Copper Company:*

Jim Schenck – Manager for Communities & Social Performance  
Vicky Peacey - Senior Manager of Approvals  
Kami Ballard – Environmental and Permitting Specialist  
Rebecca Darling – Communities

*Facilitators – Godec, Randall & Associates (GRA)*

John Godec  
Debra Duerr

*Public Guests:*

none

**Housekeeping**

Several CWG members said they needed to leave early tonight to attend a special meeting of the Town Council. Therefore, the agenda was reorganized to accommodate a shorter schedule.

John Godec asked attendees to introduce themselves. A new Resolution staff member, Rebecca Darling, introduced herself and was welcomed by the group.

Godec told the group that the third-party contractor for the Resolution Copper Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is planning to conduct interviews with some stakeholders in the region, and asked the CWG for permission to give their individual contact information to that company. Everyone agreed to allow their names and contact information to be provided to the contractor. It was thought that these interviews would be conducted over approximately the next two weeks.

### **CWG Subcommittee Status**

John Godec gave a brief update on the status of CWG subcommittees and task forces, as follows:

- The Recreation User Group will be meeting again on February 10 at 11:00 AM.
- Vicky Peacey will check on the cost estimating effort for smelter stack options as requested by the Historic Preservation Task Force.
- The Community Investment Subcommittee is waiting to meet until Diego Ortega has the ability to meet.
- Resolution will be drilling the first monitoring well very soon, so Peacey will work with Casey McKeon to set a date for the first Community Monitoring Task Force meeting.
- Debra Duerr will check with Ann Thomas of Tonto National Forest to follow up on setting a meeting with her to discuss travel management.
- The Conservation Lands Task Force has not been convened yet, although several contacts have been made, including Superstition Area Land Trust. Godec will work with Fred Gaudet to further coordinate this group.

### **Update on Resolution Copper Project NEPA Activities & Status**

Vicky Peacey – Resolution Copper Company

Vicky Peacey asked the group if everyone received the public notice of the objection period for the tailings site characterization Environmental Assessment (EA); it appeared that everyone had received it. Peacey noted that this post-EA objection period is a relatively new process. Resolution expects a final decision in 90 days or less, so will possibly be able to start field work in April. She asked the CWG if they would like to learn more about the specific drilling program, and members said they would be very interested in that. Members noted that it's always helpful for them to know what's going on with the project, since they often are asked questions from their neighbors and constituents. Peacey also invited members to visit the site and observe field work.

Jim Schenck said there will be approximately 15 local hires to conduct this work on 16 wells, which will last about 6 months. There will be several contractors on the job, mainly local ones when possible. There will also be biological and cultural resource monitors.

A CWG member asked how deep the wells would be. Peacey said that some go as deep as 2000 feet, mainly to make sure there is not an ore body under the tailings site. Members wondered what would happen if an ore body was found, but no one had a specific answer to this question.

Peacey told the group that all the responses to comments on the EA are located at the Superior Library and at the Queen Valley fire station. A Queen Valley representative said that a couple of people were upset that they couldn't get hard copies of documents from those locations. Peacey said the materials are available online.

Peacey updated the group on the status of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Resolution Copper Project and land exchange. Regarding the planned stakeholder interviews, she characterized this as pre-scoping outreach, or 'informal scoping', and noted that this activity is somewhat different from most EIS processes. Vicky thinks this is a good approach. She showed a slide summarizing the EIS process. It is expected that there will be a scoping meeting at the end of February or early March in Queen Valley, before winter visitors leave. Other planned scoping meetings will probably be in the East Valley and in Globe. A meeting for the San Carlos community will likely also be requested from the Tribal Council. It is believed that these meetings will be conducted in an open house format. The goal is to do a lot of community outreach during scoping, and it's possible that the Forest Service may want to meet with the CWG during this phase as well.

Several CWG members said that the Forest Service open house approach is not effective or satisfying for participants. They felt that, for example, Resolution does a much better job with its public meetings. Peacey said she believes there will be more substance and better approaches during this EIS, as there are different Forest Service people involved than in previous efforts, and they have engaged an experienced and well-regarded environmental consultant, SWCA. Members asked if there would be people available at the scoping meetings to answer questions, because this has not always been the case in the past. Peacey thought there would be sufficient staff, although there is not a lot of information to convey at this time, and these meetings are mainly to gather public comments.

When the Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS (NOI) comes out, it will be published in the Federal Register. Peacey will also notify the group as soon as she knows about it. The Mine Plan of Operations and land exchange proposal will be available for public review on the Forest Service website referred to as SOPA (Schedule of Proposed Actions), at:

<http://fs.fed.us/sopa/forest-level.php?110312>

### **CWG Discussion of NEPA Scoping Comments**

Due to time constraints at this CWG meeting, it was agreed by the group that this discussion would be postponed until the February CWG meeting. Debra Duerr asked the group to review, once again, the compendium of issues and mitigation suggestions based on past CWG work in

preparation for that discussion. The goal of the exercise will be to agree on which topics to include in a CWG scoping letter.

### **Finalize Locations for Visual Simulation Viewpoints**

Kami Ballard – Resolution

Kami Ballard reminded the group that at the last meeting they discussed visual simulations of the tailings and suggested 16 locations to be used as viewpoints. Truscupe has prepared ‘block’ simulations for these viewpoints, using digital data. Tonight, she’s asking the group to narrow these down to 8-10 locations for preparing the detailed simulations. Truscupe will take photos of the sites selected, so these can be used to prepare detailed simulations.

Ballard showed a map comparing the locations identified by Truscupe and the locations suggested by the CWG. She noted that some of these locations are very close to each other, so that some may not be needed.

Locations for simulated photos suggested by consensus of the CWG at the last meeting include the following. Ballard showed the block simulations that have been prepared for each of these CWG viewpoints. Notes from the group’s discussion of whether to keep each viewpoint are shown below under each location. Photos will be taken for all “YES” and “MAYBE” locations.

- \*\*US 60, Gonzales Pass, MP 219
  - *YES, take photo and develop simulation*
- Boyce Thompson Arboretum, either in parking lot or on main trail
  - *YES, take photo and develop simulation of view from parking lot*
- Pickett Post House (in future)
  - *MAYBE, keep for future simulation. Eventually, most visitors will take the trail to the house.*
- Arizona Trail crossing of Forest Road 293
  - *MAYBE*
- \*\*Arizona Trail at Barnett Camp, just above Happy Camp Road
  - *YES*
- Arizona Trail south of US60 - 1 mile S of Pickett Post trailhead
  - *MAYBE*
- Superior town, Hill Street at 177 – (used top of Terrace Street)
  - *NO*
- Superior on Ray Road
  - *YES*
- Superior Highlands Phase 3
  - *MAYBE, this may be a ‘hot’ area for real estate, so it might be useful to have it for future reference*
- Airport landing strip
  - *NO*
- \*\*Forest Road 172, ½ mile north of 357 – actually done at 1.6 miles north
  - *YES*

- Hewitt Station Road residences adjacent to tailings (Matthews house)
  - YES, but modify the location of the photo on Road 172 for a better perspective (this one is too close to tailings to get the full effect)
- **\*\*Coming down 177 from Kearny and Globe/Miami (westbound), just past cattle guard)**
  - YES
- US 60 East of Superior westbound at MP 226 to 228
  - NO
- Forest Road 650 on top
  - NO, *won't see it at all but may be the wrong coordinates*
- Queen Valley
  - MAYBE
- Overhead flyover of tailings footprint
  - \*\* 4 locations agreed upon as boundaries for the overview animation. These are indicated above with \*\**

A CWG member asked if the tailings pile would be flat on top; this is the feature that seems to make it most noticeable at a distance. Peacey said it normally would be flat, but agreed this is a noticeable element in the landscape. It was suggested that there might be options for contouring the site at reclamation and that this could be discussed with Frank Deal.

When the photos are taken for the agreed simulations, Ballard will invite appropriate CWG members to accompany the photographer.

### **Public Questions & Comments**

There were no members of the public in attendance.

### **Next Meeting**

The next CWG Meeting will be:  
*5:30 PM*  
*Wednesday, February 10, 2016*  
*Superior Chamber of Commerce*