

July 31, 2013 Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Attendees

Community Working Group members:

Pam Bennett – Queen Valley HOA president
Nancy Vogler – LOST Trail (Pickett Post to tunnel)
Roy Chavez – Concerned Citizens and Retired Miners Association
Pam Rabago – Superior Chamber of Commerce
Mark Siegwarth – Boyce Thompson Arboretum
Lynn Heglie - businessman

Facilitator - Godec, Randall & Associates (GRA):

John Godec
Debra Duerr

Resolution Copper:

Vicky Peacey - senior manager of approvals, communities & environment
Frank Deal – tailings manager
Andrew Taplin – project manager

Visitors:

Hank Gutierrez

Observations and Comments on 7/20 Field Trip & Meeting

The group discussed the field trip that occurred on July 20. In general, most people who attended thought it was very informative, and that it was interesting to go to places that aren't publically accessible. We agree that additional field trips can be planned in the future as there are things the group would like to see, including specific tailings locations.

Suggestions for Additional CWG Members

The group liked the idea of adding students and younger people, since they are the ones who will be living with this project over a long time. Lynn Heglie has a suggestion

for a particular student. It was pointed out that this person should be articulate and should be able to report back to the student body. Perhaps someone from Student Council or the business group at the high school would be good. The group also suggested a representative from the parents' group, a teacher, and/or an administrator.

John Godec asked members to let him know if they have other thoughts or suggestions for additional members. Meanwhile, he will contact the school superintendent to inquire about their interest and suggestions for participants.

Andrew Taplin Remarks

Mr. Taplin is the overall project manager for the Resolution Copper Project. He thanked members very much for making this valuable contribution to the planning process. He noted that while Resolution may have very good technical people, they don't know what's best for the community, and that's why they want to work with you. He emphasized that this process has his full support, and Resolution is appreciative of the group's contribution.

Tailings Facility Siting Criteria Brainstorming & Discussion

Group Suggestions:

Godec introduced the topic of criteria for tailings siting. He asked the group to think about the question:

- What are the three most important things you think should be considered in selecting a mine tailings disposal facility site?

The group was asked to write their three most important issues or concerns on 3x5 cards, one per card.

These cards were posted on the wall. A discussion took place to organize the ideas into broader categories of criteria, where there were similarities, common themes, or overlap. The results of this exercise are attached, in a separate document entitled ***Tailings Siting Criteria Suggested by the Community Working Group.***

Resolution then talked about the internal criteria they will use in identifying a tailings site to include in the Mine Plan of Operations and Environmental Impact Statement. These are:

- Tenure – who owns the land and the mineral rights

- Capacity – volume needed
- Proximity and elevation – to residential and local areas
- Geology – not water permeable, protect groundwater, impact on tailings management aspects
- Geochemistry – chemical agents that dissolve in water
- Air quality – prevailing winds, proximity to people & wilderness area
- Water management – flows, proximity to drainages,
- Regulatory - ability to meet groundwater quality standards & other regs.
- Aesthetics – screen, blend into terrain, progressive reclamation potential
- Recreation – proximity to and effects on trails and recreation areas, and need to mitigate for impacts
- Cultural and natural resources
- Cost

Questions and comments included the following:

- Ms. Rabago distributed copies of comments she had gotten from her conversations with Chamber of Commerce members. A copy of this paper is also attached to these notes. Comments will be included in future discussions about tailings locations, as relevant.
- Do you need to have a reclamation plan?
 - Yes, Resolution must file a closure and reclamation plan and have post-closure financial assurance. Compliance with this will be a condition of approval for the mine, and there will be inspections for compliance. Air quality permits can also come into play in making sure reclamation is done properly.
- Is there a hierarchy for these criteria?
 - It depends on who you ask...Capacity is probably the most important. Other factors that are important and implied in this list are public and worker health and safety and public acceptability.
- A member pointed out that communication is key to public knowledge, understanding, and acceptability. He complimented Resolution for trying to keep the community informed.
- Please clarify the issue of tenure.

- Tenure means who owns the land surface and who owns the minerals beneath. The concern is whether it's possible for Resolution to gain access to or ownership of these.
- It seems like the group's list and Resolution's list are similar and somewhat overlapping, except for the issues associated with community considerations.
- Based on the Mine Plan of Operation, we will need to carefully look at effects on the town and the community, and people are going to continue to ask questions. The member believes that most people don't really understand the magnitude of the project, especially the tailings facility. A main concern will be how the project affects the economic prosperity of Superior.
- Superior will be in the middle of a negative environmental impact, because the mine will be on the east and the tailings will be on the west. This will have an effect on outdoor recreation.
- Future vitality and investment in the community need to be considered.
- Will there be a bond to guarantee that the mine will be done in a responsible way, different from the past?
 - Yes. Environmental requirements are very different since the National Environmental Policy Act was adopted in 1969.

Presentation of Additional Renderings Requested by Group

Peacey showed a rendering of the sites from US 60 coming toward Superior from Gonzales Pass, and another from the entrance to Boyce Thompson Arboretum. Another was shown from about a mile west of the Arboretum on US 60, both with and without reclamation after about 40 years at full volume. She noted that revegetation begins to look complete after about 2 to 5 years. Another was done from The Highlands, again with and without reclamation.

Questions were:

- Will there be a revegetation plan?
 - Yes, the Forest Service will require one, but we don't know exactly what it may involve.

- A member said the renderings are very good. He wondered if it would be possible to have a 3-D rendering or model of the sites, showing location, how it grows, where it would be visible from, and the scale in relation to the surrounding landscape.

Public Comments

Our guest responded to a comment made at the meeting that the community doesn't understand the magnitude of the project. He feels that this isn't true. Based on his conversations with the Chamber and others in the community, there is a high level of understanding and awareness. Overall, this community is really engaged.

Open Discussion & Next Meeting Agenda

The group agreed that at the next meeting we will look at the alternative sites developed by Resolution in relation to the siting criteria we've talked about tonight. They would like to look at as many sites as possible before screening too many out; this will probably be about 5 or 6 sites. Resolution will also need to provide their assessment of their technical criteria. Doing this will help document our preferences, if any, and serve as a basis for future discussions in the context of the NEPA process.

A Note on Meeting Summaries

After the meeting, Mr. Chavez spoke to the facilitator to clarify that he doesn't agree with everything that is said or happens in the meetings. He said that he is sometimes uncomfortable with the way meeting summaries are prepared, in that we characterize discussions as "the group said" or "the group seemed to agree". He asked us to note, for reference, that he isn't necessarily included in that characterization. He wants to go on the record that he supports the project but doesn't support the mining method.

When Godec, Randall & Associates began facilitating the meetings of this group, we told members that we would not attribute specific comments to particular individuals in our meeting summaries. However, if at any time, any member would like us to note their comments or suggestions in the summaries, please let us know that, as Mr. Chavez did at this meeting.