

AJ Mine Advisory Committee (AJMAC)

MINUTES

Thursday, April 21, 2011
5:00 PM
Assembly Chambers

Committee Members: Donna Pierce (Chair), Kurt Fredriksson (Vice Chair, by phone), Rorie Watt (Liaison), Sam Smith, Maria Gladziszewski, Laurie Ferguson Craig, Gregg Erickson, Frank Bergstrom (by phone)

Item I. Call to Order

Pierce – Called meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

Item II. Agenda Review

Pierce – Explained rules for public testimony, which will be limited to four minutes and introduced Committee members.

Item III. Approval of Minutes

Minutes – Approval deferred to next meeting.

Item IV. Items for Information

Pierce - Gave a brief explanation of the Committee's draft conditions and draft report.

Item V. Next Meeting April 28

No discussion

Item VI. Public Testimony

Peter Haoroz – Fred Morino read letter from Peter Naoroz, 466 Thane Road, submitted letter to Committee as public comment. As a Thane owner, he has no concern about his well or drinking water. CBJ, as substantial owner of the mine, should maximize the value of the mine. His concern is exacerbated by the fact that CBJ is also a regulator. Inevitably, there is a conflict of interest between those two roles. Urges CBJ to consider selling its interest in the mine in lieu of being owner and regulator. Putting the pre-conditions on any potential lease limits possibilities. Let the details be worked out later by the experts later.

Fred Morino, 3201 Douglas Hwy. – Reading from email submitted as public comment. The community's priorities should be to consider our opportunity. Lists several incentives/benefits to opening the mine. Your duty is to attract a competent partner so that this will benefit the community.

Cathie Roemmich – 4442 Mendenhall Blvd. With Juneau Chamber of Commerce and is speaking on their behalf. City is doing a great job with this Committee. Chamber appreciates the diversity of members of the Committee, but wants to caution it on the extent of its pre-conditions. Alaska is ranked 50th, as in the worst place

to do business. They were appalled by last night's paper and thought it was inappropriate of a Committee member to express an opinion against the project before the report was finalized. The mine is a great asset to this community, and this is an incredible opportunity to do it right.

Erickson – Would the Chamber of Commerce object to making it a condition that an alternative water supply be developed either at the expense of the City or the developer?

Roemmich – Nobody wants any damage to the water supply. There's got to be a way to do it with today's technology. If we have to share the expenses, then we should.

John Kato – 4005 Spruce Ln. He supports the development of a small mine within the confines of the AJ. In today's economic environment and rising oil prices, it would be in Juneau's best interest. A small mine would bring well paying jobs to town and help the economy. He concurs with the comments of Sam Smith; he has outlined a strategy of developing the mine in a responsible way to the benefit of Juneau.

Neil MacKinnon, 5900 N Douglas Hwy. – Staked the Kensington claims 39 years ago. At the time they joked that they were doing it for their grandchildren, now its not so funny. Over time, it has been difficult to sell a mine. The proposed conditions should say simply to get the best deal for the city. You need to look at a deal that will work for a long period of time under several different conditions. 20 years from now, you don't want the conditions to restrict what can be done with the availability of new technology. Your thinking is too narrow for trying to attract mining companies. Water system comments? The main concern should be crafting a fair deal. The rest of the conditions will be taken care of by the Planning Commission and other permitting agencies. He's not concerned with being CBJ the owner and the regulator.

Erickson – Would securing the water system make this a better deal for the city?

MacKinnon – Maybe it would. He's not sure the idea should be broached at this point. It shouldn't be locked into a business deal. It should be left open – there are other options for improving the water system. The details shouldn't be prescribed here. Details should be separate.

Scott Spickler – 10754 Horizon Dr. Sent an email and will let it stand. To echo Neil, the conditions are like selling a house, but the buyer needs to go with the color of carpet. The water is important, but the job can be done in an environmentally sound way. Be realistic with the conditions.

Mindy Rowland – Exec. Director of First Things First. Read letter from the Board of Directors. Reopening the mine would provide many valuable benefits. All residents will benefit from the additional revenue. Pursuing this is the fiscally responsible thing to do. You as a group should not consider yourselves responsible for prescribing specific restrictions. Issues would be better addressed through the long permit process. CBJ should undertake the issue of improving or seeking out other water sources.

Eric Twelker – 10430 Dock St. Juneau is a mining town, with two existing operating mines, and it's been good for Juneau. Mines have a life time. Juneau needs to start looking at other mines if they want to continue this. Conditions should be general and policy-oriented. Don't make them too specific. The proposed conditions seem to border on designing the mine, and they shouldn't do that. To talk about an alternative water supply seems premature until there is a plan. Piling on conditions will cost a lot of money, before we even know of a problem.

Aja Razumny, 11909 Glacier Hwy. She has many concerns, and the conditions are important. The BP incident is an example of a warranty of doing no harm as not working. She's concerned about water quality and noise and other things. We shouldn't leave it to a business to say it's going to be okay. She would like to see how that has been demonstrated.

John Kremers, 800 F St. – The requirements are good for a mine in a populated area. It's important for citizens to know about these conditions in advance of pursuing a mining company. He would want to know how the mine would work and what their responsibility is before approving. Jobs are important, but only if you can continue to live here.

Rosemary Hagevig, Douglas, AK – we know that Juneau's foundation was built on mining, and it should be pursued, but in modern permitting requirements. The amount of gold in the AJ could provide significant revenue, and CBJ has a fiduciary responsibility to pursue the mine. There are lots of issues that have been identified. The previous permits contained well over 100 conditions, and this process would be conducted again, but with more scientific information gathered. We now have observed two successful mines in Juneau. We should build on our knowledge and try to attract a developer for this project. The community will pay a price if this project isn't able to move forward.

Erickson – Would it enhance our chances of getting a mine going if we included an alternative water source?

Hagevig – There are probably many studies on the shelf, is not convinced there is a problem. Is open to looking at other options, but feels it's the responsibility of the local government to research and figure out a solution.

Marjorie Menzi, 6000 Thane Rd. – submitted comments in writing. Concur with recommendations of the Committee, but they haven't addressed the water supply of Thane residents, and this should be included in the concerns to ensure that Thane's water supply is kept safe.

Bill Heumann – 6000 Thane Rd. The water system is his biggest concern. What does the mining activity do that places it in more jeopardy than it already is? Placing tailings inside the mine is probably one of the best solutions to protect the water supply. Not concerned about the pollution issue. Issues about living on Thane Rd... How much is a new water source going to cost? The number that's been thrown out there is not a real number; we need a real number. There needs to be more good information on the water issue. It's premature to suggest that there's a true problem with the water problem. Thinks that maybe we have the issue backwards, that the water supply could actually be more secure with an operator in the mine.

Bob Sylvester, 128 Dixon St – will email comments. Under no conditions should we open the AJ. We're gambling with downtown Juneau. There are other prospects out there. Water is as important of a natural resource as the gold in the mountain, and keeping it safe should be the priority.

Erickson – Would you still oppose, if there was an alternative water source?

Sylvester – Yes.

Bill Leighty – Submitted a letter. AJ is low grade ore, so mining it will expend a lot of energy. Suggests more conditions regarding the mine using renewable energy. Suggested language for conditions regarding renewable energy for both establishing the mine and running it once it starts up. Nitrous Oxide emissions are an extremely strong greenhouse gas that is emitted with explosives, so that should be limited. There are no conditions under which we should open the mine for the reasons stated at the bottom of his letter – there is not a need for more gold in this world. Feels we have a greater responsibility as world citizens.

Douglas Mertz – 11380 N. Douglas Hwy. – This is not a small mine; it can do a lot of harm. Asked that the Committee drop the "small" reference, require bonding that provides for immediate payment should be made available as it pertains to the water supply and any harm that might come from it. Feels that treated water going into Gastineau Channel should meet discharge requirements at the point of discharge, without needing a mixing zone. Asked for strict noise standards, feels the noise impact attracted attention. There should be a citizen's oversight council of some sort, funded by mine proponents and that the oversight council should have a

transparent process and access to the mine. There should be an adequate reclamation bond that is sufficient to cover costs through the indefinite future. Last, requested that adjudication be agreed to take place in Juneau.

Ferguson Craig - How often does the Prince William Sound Citizen's Advisory Council meet and what's their function?

Mertz – The council meets a few times a year, but they have staff who are frequently meeting with shippers and residents.

Ferguson Craig – So it's not just a committee but also staff that are constantly working on the issues.

Mertz – It works well, and all involved, including the industry, like how it works.

Margo Waring, 11380 N Douglas Hwy – CBJ's primary responsibility is to the health of the community - the water supply. We have to plan for problems that might occur. She was concerned that issues brought by Dave Chambers regarding what would happen post lease – those issues can only be mitigated by having some kind of contract with a non-CBJ entity. She stresses the importance of using this approach. Once CBJ becomes a partner with a business, they won't be able to act in an objective way. An outside group would assist in that. Referenced Dave Chamber's post lease concerns and feels it will be very hard for the CBJ to jeopardize jobs in the future – this is the key problem.

Don Burford, 1275 Glacier Hwy – Water concerns are over-rated. Through the history of the community, mines have been here. I am a person who works on land, building roads, a “raider and plunderer.” Whenever I work on something, I leave it in better condition than before we were there. The AJ won't be negative. It will have problems, but if you want a company to come in to work on this mine, you have to make it attractive. Gold Creek might dry up in dry winter times, but the aquifer still has water. Be more open with conditions. See's too much “gimme, gimme, gimme” and believes that we can't make the project too restrictive because if we do – Who's going to bet on a loser?

Erik Borgus, 139 Gastineau Ave, Exec Director of Trail Mix – Their sole concern is potential impacts to Perseverance Trail and Sheep Creek Trail. Perseverance is worth protecting. Perseverance is the 3rd most active trail in Juneau. They're not against the mine, but they would like to see the trails unaffected. A good example of development and trails working OK together is the Airport dike trail.

Daniel Kirkwood, 308 Distin Ave. – Supports citizen's oversight council, protection of water system and protection against the degradation of downtown. He is in favor of the conditions protecting the various issues. Feels that tourists like the stereotypical grizzled prospector, but won't like an industrial mine.

Nancy Waterman, 227 Gastineau Ave. – She is thinking of it from the angle of management of the Gold Creek watershed. It is important to set out conditions that are made available to prospective mining companies. The topics covered are good. Stream flow, usage and water rights – are three important aspects of the water supply issue. There were flow gauges for a while, but they were removed. There should be a gauge so that there is historical data. Discussion of water rights. If something happens to Gold Creek, Salmon Creek doesn't meet our needs. Suggests a new last sentence: The contingency plan must include an alternate, equivalent water supply, the potential for temporary diversion of the drainage from the drainage tunnel, and with pause, the prohibition of mining operation in certain areas.

Ferguson Craig – Didn't know we've lost our stream gauges.

Erickson – What are the City's water rights in Gold Creek?

Waterman - 1.3 billion gallons per year.

Sue Schrader - 2623 John St. – Adopting specific conditions is to the benefit of the community. They reflect our values. That's the only way a company will be aware up front of the values of the community. Prohibiting surface caving and subsidence seems to need work. Alternative water supply should be identified up front and should be well evaluated. Regulations are important, but City needs to hire well trained and qualified staff to monitor and enforce them, or the regulations are meaningless. Emissions from all of the equipment used on the mine shouldn't add to the current air pollution. She concurs with Bill Leighty's comments. Noise – it's an issue.

Paula Terrel, 5025 Thane Rd. - Written comments submitted. Suggests that deferring to the Planning Commission and Assembly isn't taking care of what the Committee is responsible for. There won't be an EIS because it's not required, so she suggests that there be some strong statement requiring the NEPA process to be followed by an independent contractor, along the lines of an EIS. She is in favor of having an alternate water supply identified and developed before any mine exploration or development. This can be done by the City, not necessarily requiring a mining company to do it. Feels like this is a déjà vu to twenty years ago, and to hedge against problems, there should be a citizen group contracting with the mining company as has been done in other places, and it'd give the community comfort that when things change, there is something in place for the community.

Maria – Requested examples of citizen agreements. Stillwater, Montana was given as an example.

Joyce Levine, PO Box 21705 Juneau – discussed Deep Water Horizon, Exxon Valdez; earthquakes in Japan. We have earthquakes here. Why do we want to threaten our water supply, because of the price of gold? Bottled water is making more money than gold, it seems. Referenced consumer and public protections including smoking bans, bike helmets, speed limits, asks why we would willingly put the water system at risk. She's extremely concerned about the water supply, so she opposes the mine.

Alan Munro, 120 W Ninth St. – Email submitted, read comments. At first meeting, the Mayor indicated that the reason for getting this committee in place was because the oil revenues were declining. A majority of residents can't believe the City is reconsidering opening the AJ mine. The mayor suggests that other revenue sources are slowing, and we need to find a new revenue source soon. CBJ should consider the needs, not non-essential wants of the community – we're a small, finite community and small tax base, yet people and the CBJ always expect amenities of cities far greater in population.

Steve Behnke, 4545 Thane Rd. - He's submitted comments in writing. Came to the first meeting with a feeling of dread, now has a better taste in his mouth. A small mine might work, but as long as you keep trying to find a balance between public interest and private interest. He likes some of the concepts, but has big concerns. Developing a lease and sideboards is one thing, but having confidence that they are going to stick is another. It makes sense to get creative in the conditions, including ideas like putting Sheep Creek into a land trust, and solving the water issue. Suggests to be successful the committee should keep on doing the things that it is doing to find the balance.

Maria – Talk about a super majority concept, rather than having 5-4 votes going one way or another. What would be the mechanism for providing some assurance?

Behnke – How do you get buy-in by the community? Super majority is an idea. Community vote maybe? But that is divisive and costly. Maybe the Assembly commits itself to an information gathering process, similar to an EIS.

Break

Larri Spengler, 4545 Thane Rd. – She submitted written comment. Appreciated the Committee’s efforts, there is a chance to avoid the acrimony from the last mine attempt. If the City decides to go through with trying to have a new mine, people will care a lot. This room reminds her of 20 years ago. Through your conditions, you have the ability to take some of the biggest issues off of the table. Even though this smaller mine concept is very different, there are still the same concerns from 20 years ago. An alternative water supply seems like a no brainer. A financial guarantee seems isn’t going to do anything if the water is polluted. Sheep Creek valley issues can be taken off the table. There’s been no discussion of it, but a recommendation can be made to create a conservation easement not allowing any mining activity in Sheep Creek Valley. It would reassure people if that were off the table.

Tom Bryce – President of Juneau Building Trades Council. Supports the efforts so far. The mine should be developed. CBJ has shown great concern for community needs, and he’s glad to see that local hire has been addressed. This mine will boost the economy, create job opportunities, and help anchor young people to this community. Feels it doesn’t help to draw comparison to deepwater horizon, and earthquakes. Feels it is not a zero sum game. Southeast is losing population, reapportionment will weaken the region. This could help with that issue.

Tina Brown, 19400 Beardsley Way – Under no conditions should the AJ be opened. It’s irresponsible and reckless to risk the water supply. Air and noise pollution are inevitable. Accidents are inevitable, and many are deadly. Contaminating the creek has many effects. No amount of regulations can help this. When the mining company leaves, Juneau is left cleaning up. Be forward thinking – about clean manufacturing, and year round tourism attractions. AJ is in the wrong place. No amount of money is worth risking the clean air, water, wildlife.

Greg Brown, 19400 Beardsley Way – Government is responsible for providing clean air and clean water. Lots of recent incidents indicate that you can’t prepare for any accident that can happen (Chile, Japan, Deep Water Horizon, etc.). Water quality, traffic, noise, dust, carbon footprint – all issues you can’t get rid of. He was told that when Lake Dorothy came online electric prices would go down. That hasn’t happened. There’s the threat of the Chieftain mine. They could affect the Taku River basin. Money isn’t everything, Juneau is the emerald of Alaska. Don’t have a mine in downtown Juneau.

John Barry, 12175 Glacier Hwy – He is currently employed at Kensington Mine, but worked for Echo Bay in the ‘90s. Regarding tailings disposal – when he worked with Sam Smith on the small mine concept, ore sorting was the cornerstone of the plan. Historically 50% of the mined material was dumped in the channel as fine tailings. There is enough room in the old stopes of the AJ to store 3500 tons per day of tailings for 3 years. Kensington paste backfill plant – using that method, along with the existing stopes for tailings storage, there is plenty of area underground to dispose of tailings. Paste backfill and coarse sorting is the solution. Greens Creek is able to put 60% of its tailings back underground. Combining coarse sorting with paste backfill means that a mine could operate indefinitely.

The waste rock is a separate issue. Sheep Creek adit will need to be used as a secondary escape. Sea level access is essential to keep mining operations away from the Gold Creek. Mill should be underground. Using waste fill material – consider adding to south end of rock dump area. Water source should have the highest priority. There’s more gold than the small mine concept shows, per the resource model, and paste backfill is probably the key to that.

Ferguson Craig – Coarse sorting question – where has that been done on a similar scale.

Barry – The AJ itself. The old mill sheet in the archived document that shows that a lot less material that will be handled – about 20%. About 2/3 of mill feed is screened out, then half of the mill feed would be sorted or about 1/6 of the total amount.

Bob Marshall, 3251 Nowell Ave. – Submitted written comments. Reason last AJ mine effort didn't succeed is that the size/volume of the mine was so large. The proposed conditions don't include any statement about the vision of this mine being a smaller concept than Echo Bay's proposal. There should be a strong vision expressed to potential mining companies. A business coming in should have that information. He recommends finding an alternative water supply. Dealing with excess rock – there's a lot of volume, so there should be limits set and it shouldn't be trucked or barged. Wastewater discharge – EPA produced a Technical Assistance Report during the Echo Bay effort, and he read from that. Said that the TAR found that wastewater treatment was not feasible. Discussed use of a mixing zone - cautioned against its use, requested end of pipe standards be used.

Chris Martin, Second St. – Loves the quality of life in downtown Juneau. Downtown Juneau residents will feel the effects much more than other residents in other areas of Juneau. To follow the technology blindly is foolish. He's concerned about tailings disposal, wastewater disposal, water supply and many other things. Mines have a long term effect, far beyond many of its residents. We should be concerned about the environmental and social issues. He opposes this mine. And says it is not our job to roll out a red carpet.

Jonas Lamb – 312A Sixth St. Represents Downtown Juneau Neighborhood Association, AJ Mine Subcommittee. Highest priorities: pedestrian safety, traffic volume/speed, character and operation of the mine, noise, and quality of life issues pertaining to clean water, air, etc. Small mine summary made it sound that it'd have a minimal impact to downtown, but that doesn't seem feasible. Concerned about the water supply. What's the backup plan for water? If 3rd party oversight is formed, they'd like to be considered for participation on the committee. Wants evidence that Downtown will not be affected.

Carl Schrader, 2623 John St. – Worked for DEC, Fish & Game, and DNR, on environmental quality issues. He's been on the regulatory side and also on the applicant side. Supports a majority of the recommendations. Wants to see financial assurances to fully fund restoration costs. Drinking water issue – even if chances of hurting the water supply are really small, the consequences are huge. Mines do pollute. Once it occurs it's hard to control. We have two operating mines which have both had water quality problems. Greens Creek has had problems with acid mine/rock drainage issues. Kensington had significant water quality problems. His work at DNR involved trying to help get water issues resolved with Kensington. A large industrial facility will have issues.

Ferguson Craig – Did discussion ever come up about an alternative water source?

Schrader – No specific options.

Michelle Forne – 9443 La Perouse Ave. She is a young person who moved here because it is beautiful, clean and safe. For every person sitting in this room who opposes the mine, there are 10 people at home worrying about it. She opposes the mine, and the impacts of the mine are about the future generations, such as hers.

Sarah Schoer. She's a wildlife biologist. She's not opposed to mining, but not in her back yard. This mine illegally dumped contaminants into the creek. It's not worth risking the water supply, but if it does move forward, it should have strict restrictions.

Deb Craig, 3251 Nowell Ave. – Participated 20 years ago, sorry to be here today. There's been a lot of talk about mine safety. Included statistics about mining safety violations. Company is spending a lot of money on monitoring, but only after violations. Are fines and penalties part of the cost of doing business? More statistics about safety violations. Several mining companies continue to commit violations. They don't have a stellar record for safety. Why would Juneau support a risky venture with an industry that has a bad record of safety, environmental clean-up, etc. The risk of the project is too high for what we can gain. She doesn't oppose mining, but does oppose this mine in the heart of her community.

James Marcus, 317 Sixth St. – Water quality – Juneau’s tap water is better than most you can buy in stores. He’s concerned about the diversification of the economy, but it should be done in a sustainable way. The proactive approach with all the conditions is appreciated. How much will be spent by City in pondering this decision? Will it equal the amount of revenue generated? Will the Juneau citizens receive royalty checks? He’s not against mining, but not in downtown Juneau. If project moves forward, protect Sheep Creek. Consider an alternative water supply. There should be significant bonds in place. A citizen action panel would be very important. It’s ironic that we’re developing a climate action plan at the same time as looking at opening the mine. Conflict of interest troubles him.

Guy Archibald, 1016 Bonnie Doon – He’s an ex-miner, chemist and biologist and works for SEACC. Since project is connected to the drinking water system, it needs to be held to a higher standard. Greens Creek and Kensington have lots of regulations they follow, and they’re thriving. Mines go through an extensive permitting process, but the system hasn’t shown to be protective. They still end up polluting surface and ground water. Last Chance Basin (LCB) watershed is particularly vulnerable. How to gauge the vulnerability? Redundancy. There is no backup to LCB water source. No mine should be promoted until there is another alternative drinking watershed up and running.

Ferguson Craig – What’s going on in Craig? There’s a side reaction with chlorine?

Archibald – when you use chlorine in water, there’s sometimes a side reaction. Craig had to put a notice out and notify customers.

Maria – Asked the source of a statistic regarding 70% of mines that do pollute.

Archibald – The source is on the information submitted to the Committee.

Pierce – What were the mines doing right that didn’t pollute the water?

Arch – They weren’t mining rock that had acid mine potential. They were doing lots of things different. The ones that were polluting, it wasn’t one thing that made them pollute, but rather lots of things in combination.

Pierce – It’s the community that owns the mine, and the Assembly is the body elected to represent the community. Why would a citizen body that wasn’t elected be more beneficial?

Archibald – Assembly members have a fiduciary obligation, and they’re under a lot of political pressure. During Kensington, the District Ranger was getting pressure to approve the permit from the Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. A citizen’s committee doesn’t have that same pressure. This adds another layer of protection. There’s no silver bullet.

Pierce – There is definitely some pressure; this Committee has been feeling it.

Fredriksson – Wanted to know the names of the mines doing it right.

Lauren Smoker – 5855 Thane Rd. written testimony submitted. Developing the AJ mine under any circumstances will negatively affect many qualities and features of downtown Juneau. The City should not pursue this mine.

Garreth Hummel, 3488 Meander Way – It shouldn’t matter about all mining, it should only be about this mine. He is opposed to this mine. Under no circumstances should it move forward. If it is determined to go forward, this document (conditions) is a good start. Water is his main concern, but all concerns are good. They should all be strengthened. A mine in our watershed should never be established. It’s very dangerous and not safe. If it

does go forward, that aspect of this conditions document should be greatly strengthened. There should be another water source developed and functional before this mine goes forward. This could contribute to a population decrease. Would consider moving if the mine opened.

Olivia Snaiko, N Douglas Hwy – Attorney with SEACC. Leaving it up to business and technology to protect the environment is not the answer. Concerns – enforceability. DEC has many regulations, but there is a lot of discretion. CBJ will be left as the primary regulator monitoring compliance, and that presents conflict issues. There is no way to ensure that regulations are fully enforced. For this reason it's essential for CBJ to set up a 3rd party, citizen oversight group. It won't be perfect, but it would be the best way to ensure that these conditions will be upheld. An appointed body is not as much subjected to political pressure as an elected body.

Maria – The citizen's committee – if they're appointed by people who are elected, how is that any better than an elected body. They're still subject to pressure.

Snaiko – She doesn't think they're subjected to the same level of pressure. It needs to be explored. If they're in place for a long term, instead of through election cycles, maybe that would be the solution.

Watt – How does CBJ protect itself from itself? He read the Stillwater agreement, but it wasn't similar to this situation. It's between the mining company and three conservation groups, none of which is an owner of the mineral rights, such as CBJ is. It'd be great if someone could find a similar situation to Juneau in that the government entity owns the mine.

Snaiko – It would take some strong, intelligent conversation with very knowledgeable people to figure out the details regarding the various legal issues.

Robert Lindekuger. 839 Dixon St. – There are no conditions that would be appropriate to open the AJ. A contingency plan to address drinking water is nonsensical. It should be solved before any potential harm. He opposes the mine. His vote as a taxpayer is no mine.

Clay Frick, Thane Rd. – He shares a dim view of opening the mine, for the same reasons many others have stated. Water quality is a big issue. Polluting the primary water source does damage to so many things. It's too much of a risk, and it's not worth it. He's concerned about the many hats the City would wear. There's too much political pressure involved. Things change and mines expand over time. He's concerned about the monitoring of water quality in perpetuity. No one can look into the future to see how it will be 15 years from now. Having to monitor forever isn't realistic. Hopes that the City shelves the idea.

Ben Creasy - He's not opposed to mining in general, but gold mining doesn't make sense. It's a misallocation of resources, because gold isn't worth it. There was a gold bubble a few decades ago, and then it collapsed. It can happen again. If space aliens watched a gold mine from outer space, they would think we were crazy. All that effort to remove rock from the earth move it around, remove a small percentage and then put most of it right back underground. All to create jewelry? How much is it worth to risk the watershed. If the mine brought in significant revenue, that might be worth it, but the numbers don't warrant risking the water. Other costs aren't factored in, health issues affected by the mine. He is especially opposed to the need for gold.

Ferguson Craig – We had asked for a 3D model, did we ever get that?

Watt – We have one, but it is very hard to display. The 3D model at the City Museum gives a good idea.

Kiel Renick, Aurora Harbor – lists conditions: guarantee that local water source would not be affected. Elicit or accidental activities still happen; demonstrated need for jobs – Juneau has a very low unemployment rate. The

long term financial benefits to the community should be assured. Guarantee that there is not a negative impact to the quality of life. Life is good in Juneau. Please don't let this project change it forever.

Dixie Hood – 9350 View Dr. – Appreciates the public process. Loves Juneau and the quality of life here, thinks there are other ways to develop the economy. She opposes the AJ mine under any circumstances. Discusses article from newspaper about water source. She endorses statements by Tina Brown and Chris Martin. There should be some sort of financial bond addressing other potential water sources. She hopes it doesn't even go that far.

Aaron Brakel, Douglas, AK – So interesting to be here. The AJ was a formative battle of my youth, and now staring at middle age...WOW!! Discussed toxic divisiveness from 20 years ago. Reasons for having an oversight committee, appointed probably, is that there could be reserved seats for environmentalists and scientists – people who have a good background for dealing with the mining process. Having this group would help the community to be represented. John Barry spoke earlier – said using paste backfill technology would allow a lot of the material to stay in the mine. Mine plans change and there could be pressure to increase the size of the mine. Both of the active mines here have included large expansions or plans for expansion. Specifically Slate Creek at Kensington. Worried about noise from waste rock.

Laura Stats, 418 Seventh St. – This is round 2 for her, sad to be thinking about this again. She doesn't enjoy having to come and defend our great community attributes: our water, peace and quiet. To put our water at risk... it's common sense – there aren't any conditions that you could come up with to create a mine in the middle of a tourist town. There aren't any conditions that would let downtown residents maintain their current quality of life. I hope the investigation is short.

Ben Creasy – Proven reserves and resources. Asked about what we know about this ore body.

Smith – There are good numbers on the reserves, based on Echo Bay's exploration. There would need to be more drilling by a junior mining company. It's not like they'd be starting from scratch.

Echo Bay's historical records are the property of AEL&P and CBJ, and they'd be made available to a potential mining company. That's not this committee's job. The City won't spend a bunch of money to go out and do a lot of drilling. That will be a junior mining company's responsibility.

Item VII. Written Comments from Public

Comments were received and put into the record.

Item VIII. Committee Member Comments

No discussion regarding Gregg Erickson memo.

Item IX. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 8:58 PM