

Conversation Contents

Skull Valley, AZ Meeting Re Kirkland Mine

"Hawes, David" <rhawes@blm.gov>

From: "Hawes, David" <rhawes@blm.gov>
Sent: Fri May 15 2015 15:51:30 GMT-0600 (MDT)
To: Patrick Putnam <pputnam@blm.gov>
Subject: Skull Valley, AZ Meeting Re Kirkland Mine

Last night there were more 100 people -- probably the most polite and good-natured 100 people I've ever witnessed oppose a project, but there wasn't one supporter of the project in the room. I told them that we have not finished reviewing and analyzing the plan of operation, at which time I will determine the level of environmental review required under NEPA -- a Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment (EA), or Environmental Impact Statement.

About halfway through the meeting, Yavapai County Supervisor Rowle Simmons who attended the meeting said that he would bring this issue to the Board of Supervisors and call upon the BLM to do a full environmental analysis. That will be in the form of letter to Patrick Putnam, Acting DM. That alone would be enough to require an EA for me. At the same time, due to the fact that the proposal already meets two of the "extraordinary circumstances" under NEPA, I will be making the determination that an EA is required. (Those extraordinary circumstances are: 1. may have controversial environmental effects and 2. may have uncertain or potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.) I regret that the EA will be an additional expense and amount of time required to assess the project.

The mining company already heard about the meeting and called claiming that residents' concerns (dust, potential carcinogens, erosion, impacts to water quantity and quality, air quality, noise, and loss of riparian and recreation resources) are misinformation, and they plan to press ahead with their plan.

— Rem

"Hawes, David" <rhawes@blm.gov>

From: "Hawes, David" <rhawes@blm.gov>
Sent: Fri May 15 2015 17:38:15 GMT-0600 (MDT)
To: Patrick Putnam <pputnam@blm.gov>
Subject: Re: Skull Valley, AZ Meeting Re Kirkland Mine

Patrick: Just had a half-hour call with Kirkland Mining Company VP Areta Zouvas. She is very unhappy about me requiring an EA rather than going with a CX on the Skull Valley area mine. She is concerned about the additional expense of an EA and amount of time required to assess the project. She feels that BLM is bowing to public pressure and "misinformation." By the end of our conversation, she understood our reasoning for going to an EA and agreed to a meeting next Thursday, May 21, at which we will go over their mineral material Stockpile Removal Plan of Operations and identify additional needs for their contractor Ninyo and Moore to complete an EA

She also stated that she had received a call from someone who opposes the mine and attended last night's meeting who said that they were writing to their Congressman (Gosar) to stop the mine, so I expect that will get referred to the BLM.

— Rem

On Fri, May 15, 2015 at 2:51 PM, Hawes, David <rhawes@blm.gov> wrote:

Last night there were more 100 people -- probably the most polite and good-natured 100 people I've ever witnessed oppose a project, but there wasn't one supporter of the project in the room. I told them that we have not finished reviewing and analyzing the plan of operation, at which time I will determine the level of environmental review required under NEPA -- a Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment (EA), or Environmental Impact Statement.

About halfway through the meeting, Yavapai County Supervisor Rowle Simmons who attended the meeting said that he would bring this issue to the Board of Supervisors and call upon the BLM to do a full environmental analysis. That will be in the form of letter to Patrick Putnam, Acting DM. That alone would be enough to require an EA for me. At the same time, due to the fact that the proposal already meets two of the "extraordinary circumstances" under NEPA, I will be making the determination that an EA is required. (Those extraordinary circumstances are: 1. may have controversial environmental effects and 2. may have uncertain or potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.) I regret that the EA will be an additional expense and amount of time required to assess the project.

The mining company already heard about the meeting and called claiming that residents' concerns (dust, potential carcinogens, erosion, impacts to water quantity and quality, air quality, noise, and loss of riparian and recreation resources) are misinformation, and they plan to press ahead with their plan.

— Rem