

October 9, 2019
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Attendees

Community Working Group members present:

Pam Bennett – Queen Valley Community Liaison
Anthony Huerta – Town of Superior
Arlynn Godinez – Superior Unified School District Board / Maricopa County
Todd Pryor – Town of Superior
Jim Schenck – Rebuild Superior and Legends of Superior Trail
Silvia Werre – Top of the World
Ricardo Provencio – United Superiorites
Bruce Wittig – Queen Valley Fire Department
Lynn Martin – JF, JI Ranch
George Martin – JF, JI Ranch
Hank Gutierrez - Superior Copper Alliance
Tweedy Armitage – Superior Historical Society
Gloria Ruiz – Town of Winkelman
Jeff Bunkleemann – Central Arizona College
Woody Cline – Gila County Supervisor
Cathy Melvin – Gila County
JoAnn Besich – Superior Optimist Club
Fred Gaudet – Arizona Trail Association
Jeff Payne – Boyce Thompson Arboretum Horticulturist

Community Working Group members not present:

Karen Kitchayan Jones – San Carlos Apache Tribe
Tino Flores – Copper Corridor Economic Development Coalition
Anna Flores – Town of Kearny
Sylvia Kerlock – Town of Winkelman
Richard Matthews – Queen Valley Water Board
Cecil Fendley – Queen Valley Water Board
Fernando Shipley – Cobre Valley Regional Medical Center Board
Mila Besich – Town of Superior
Tiffany Rowell – Superior community
Rick Cartier – Superior Chamber of Commerce
Roy Chavez – Retired Miners and Concerned Citizens
Pamela Rabago – Superior Chamber of Commerce

Resolution Copper Company:

Hesston Klenk – Resolution Copper Communities Manager
Vicky Peacey – Senior Environmental Manager

Facilitators – Godec, Randall & Associates (GRA):

John Godec, Debra Duerr

Speakers:

Mary Rasmussen – Tonto National Forest
Donna Morey – SWCA
Chris Garrett – SWCA

Public Guests:

Greg Ghidotti – Resolution Copper Mining
Andrew Lye – Resolution Copper Mining
Sterling Huntley – Resolution Copper Mining
Henry Munoz – Concerned Citizens & Retired Miners
others not signed in

Introductions & Housekeeping

John Godec welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked those present to introduce themselves. He thanked guests for coming. Mary Rasmussen, Tonto National Forest project manager for the Resolution Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and her consultant team from SWCA are here to discuss the EIS and answer the group's questions. He reminded the group that we will be having another special meeting on Monday, October 14 to finalize CWG comments on the Draft EIS, which are due to be submitted by November 7.

In local news, members said the burro run is this weekend, and BLM will be having a burro adoption center. The event was sold out, and then many people from Colorado wanted to participate. They wanted 25 burros, put a limit at 50, and ended up with about 75. The race starts at 10:00am on Saturday with many fun events before, during, and after. The Arboretum is having its annual plant sale starting this weekend and will have a Halloween event on October 26. There will be a free haunted house on Halloween in downtown Superior.

Bruce Wittig reported on the Forest Service public hearing in Queen Valley. He said that 24 people asked to speak, most of whom were representing the Native American community. People talked about a number of issues and asked for an extension of the comment period. Pam said the room was packed but only about 10-15% of attendees were from Queen Valley. Some of those said they appreciated that there is an alternative at Skunk Camp to the Near West tailings site. Gloria Ruiz said there were about 25 people at the hearing in Kearny and about 75 at the Globe meeting. She said she learned a lot from these meetings, but it did not change her opinion that the Skunk Camp tailings site is undesirable.

Discussion on Resolution Copper Project and Land Exchange Environmental Impact Statement

Mary Rasmussen – Tonto National Forest
Donna Morey – SWCA
Chris Garrett - SWCA

Mary Rasmussen said that she and SWCA are here tonight to have a discussion with the CWG, so it's very different from the public hearings where questions were not addressed. She passed out summary documents highlighting the resources that they believe the CWG is most interested in.

Starting with socioeconomic, Chris Garrett said they have not heard a lot about this topic except from the Town of Superior. They realize that more work and research is probably

needed. One comment they've heard is that there are costs mentioned in the EIS that have not been quantified. Also, the revenue components may need more detail, e.g. property tax revenue. Property value reductions were based on what happened near other tailings facilities, but these data are limited. CWG members wondered how the 4% prediction was determined. It was observed that folks below Skunk Camp would be more negatively affected by the presence of the facility and the potential for water contamination. Arizona Game and Fish Department estimates were based on hunting tags and assumed displacement of hunting opportunities at the project sites.

The CWG asked for more explanation of the dark skies impacts, which were not explained well in the EIS. Chris Garrett referred the group to the handout he'd brought and said that one measure of this is how many stars you can see. Godec asked if Superior has ever looked at becoming a dark skies community. The town said this means that lights point down not up, and they have installed many LED lights to meet this objective. If Resolution were to install suitable LED lighting it may not be that noticeable.

A CWG member asked how the decision will be made about which slurry pipeline route will be selected for the Skunk Camp site. Rasmussen said the Forest Service has identified the north option as preferred, as discussed in the DEIS Executive Summary and Chapter 2, but the CWG is welcome to weigh in on this topic if desired.

Regarding the Arizona Trail, representatives asked what happens where the trail crosses the MARRCO rail line; what happens is not detailed in the EIS. Peacey suggested that this needs to be a question or comment to ask for details.

The CWG observed that in the transportation analysis 6 intersections in and around town are examined during construction, but no mitigation is outlined. Peacey responded that Resolution can't do anything to ADOT roads, for example, but could for others now that impacts have been predicted. The town is asking that a traffic management plan be developed and followed, but noted that somebody has to fund it, as Superior doesn't have the funds. A CWG member also wondered if people in Gold Canyon have asked about an alternative route around there, where there is seemingly come controversy about traffic.

Rasmussen mentioned that if the CWG has any concerns about the filter plant they could comment on that; for example, questions have arisen about why the railroad is only used in combination with the Silver King tailings option. If the filter plant is built in Superior it will be in the middle of a residential area. The Forest Service has some information about impacts of the in-town filter plant location, which would have the effect of increased industrialization of town. She suggested that the group could also comment on the rail line being co-used for tourism since that has been an ongoing desire of the CWG.

Chris Garrett pointed out that there are different types of mitigation outlined in the DEIS. Applicant-committed measures are either built into the project or agreed to by Resolution, and these have been accounted for in the EIS analysis. Other types of mitigation are not committed

at this point, and some resources do not outline any mitigation, e.g. socioeconomics. If mitigation measures are suggested during the comment period they will be considered. For some things, mitigation is not even possible; property value impacts may be an example of this. Rasmussen clarified cooperating agencies' roles and responsibilities in the EIS process, and the situations in which the Forest Service has authority to require mitigation versus the areas where voluntary mitigation is needed.

The CWG had the following questions and comments:

- Is the Forest Service still working on developing information for other critical topics such as water resources and the Skunk Camp tailings site?
 - Yes, as is Resolution, primarily through the environmental permitting processes.
- Would Resolution buy the affected properties, e.g. at Dripping Springs near Skunk Camp?
 - Vicky Peacey reported that company representatives have been talking to the residents, and this has been done before.
- How many people in Superior are available to work at the mine?
 - The unemployment rate here is not bad. New residents and new housing would be a more significant benefit. However, the Town feels that each new resident costs more in services than it gains in benefits.
- A CWG member noted that the reason there may not have been a lot of concern for 'socioeconomics' is because people who commented don't live here. That doesn't mean these issues aren't important to Superior. This town is unique – not rural but not metropolitan.
- Is an influx of construction workers covered in the socioeconomic section?
 - No. This might present opportunities for the town to outline what it wants to happen.

Godec asked the group if they've heard reactions and comments from the community. They reported that people are upset that the school district won't be getting the money they thought because of the state's equalization regulations – all other taxpayers in Pinal County will benefit from lower taxes. Sterling Huntley from Resolution explained some of the issues that surround this in Arizona, including the distribution rules for government income, which provide money to everyone but not much to the local affected jurisdictions. Water is another area that people don't really understand. Many people think that there won't be any water. SWCA noted that they've heard water supply concerns from SanTan Valley about groundwater supplies there, and from Top-of-the-World about wells. Monitoring is meant to account for this. In general, Top-of-the-World residents understand that monitoring will be performed and water supplies will be replaced by Resolution digging deeper wells if needed. Peacey emphasized that getting baseline data is important in this regard. Resolution said they are in the process of 'ramping up' the water monitoring network and program, which could include Top-of-the-World; Queen Valley will also become part of this system.

Peacey explained that the required Clean Water Act Sec. 404 permit looks at mitigating impacts to surface waters like Queen Creek. This could include putting a conservation easement on parcels and doing invasive species management. An important aspect will be to look at how the predicted 18% reduction in water flow can be replaced. Mitigation will be more detailed in the final Sec. 404 permit. A CWG member asked what mitigation credits are in the Sec. 404 permit. Peacey said this is a newer concept in lieu of on-site mitigation, whereby the number of acres

affected can be offset by purchasing credits from those who have the to sell in other locations. For example, the Lower San Pedro has acres of credit available that Resolution could buy and conserve.

The CWG asked for clarification that if a mitigation is detailed (in EIS, Sec. 404, other permits) and mentioned in the Record of Decision (ROD) it will need to be done. The Forest Service confirmed that mitigation included in the ROD will be required. Rasmussen emphasized that it will be important for the CWG to make comments about what the community wants and thinks is important regarding Queen Creek.

The CWG thanked Forest Service representatives for making this special effort to speak with them, and for the impact summary information.

Community Monitoring

Members of the Community Monitoring Task Force shared a concern they have with the inability of this group to monitor the Martin well. Apparently, the recent problem has been that Resolution is using Montgomery and Associates to take samples at this well rather than Resolution staff sampling it, as they do with the task force for the other wells. Montgomery conducts their sampling program according to their own schedule, which is not coordinated with the Community Monitoring Task Force. The group asked that Resolution advise on how these schedules can be coordinated so that the CWG's consultant can join in on sampling this well at the same time. Peacey said she will figure out how to make this happen in future.

Discussion of CWG Comments on DEIS

Members of the CWG continued their discussion about comments they would like to submit to the Forest Service regarding the DEIS. The main concern of the group is that there should be programs in place to make sure that the communities impacted do not experience negative impacts. Some of their suggestions for things to emphasize in the comment letter included:

- Preventative mitigations should be done "up front" for stream impacts.
- Socioeconomic impacts need to be quantified. Costs need to be determined, and somebody needs to pay for this.
- An endowment fund should be established to address socioeconomic impacts, since the current contractual agreements between the Town of Superior and Resolution Copper are only for a 5-year duration. The main issues with this approach are determining an appropriate dollar amount and who is going to pay.
- A program to fund community heritage projects – as outlined by the CWG and the community in previous years – should be included. (Resolution said they continue to work on this.)
- Comments about dark skies should be included, as this is a new issue that has emerged.

It was agreed that the facilitators would prepare a draft letter for the CWG to review, modify, and approve before the submission deadline of November 7. A first draft will be distributed to members before October 14, when the CWG will hold a special meeting to review it.

Public Questions & Comments

There were no public comments.

Next Meeting

The next CWG meeting is planned for:

October 14, 2019 (special meeting)
5:30 pm
Superior Chamber of Commerce

The purpose of this is to finalize CWG comments on the DEIS. It was agreed that this second October meeting will take the place of a group meeting in November.