



BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA
COMMISSION ON MINERAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF MINERALS
400 W. King Street, Suite 106
Carson City, Nevada 89703
(775) 684-7040 • Fax (775) 684-7052
<http://minerals.nv.gov/>



RICHARD PERRY
Administrator

Las Vegas Office: 2030 E. Flamingo Rd. #220, Las Vegas, NV 89119
Phone: (702) 486-4343; Fax: (702) 486-4345

STATE OF NEVADA
COMMISSION ON MINERAL RESOURCES

Thursday, November 5, 2015 – 1:00 p.m.
Bishop Manogue High School
110 Bishop Manogue Dr. Reno, NV 89511

MINUTES

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Richard DeLong-Chairman
Fred Gibson
Dennis Bryan
Arthur Henderson
John Mudge
David Parker
John Snow

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Rich Perry - Administrator (NDOM)
Valerie Kneefel (NDOM)
Lowell Price (NDOM)
Nick Potter (NDOM)
Mike Visher (NDOM)
Bill Durbin (NDOM)
Bryan Stockton (AG)
Lucia Patterson (NDOM)

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Enos
Jaron Hildebrand
Alan Coyner
Russ Fields
Jim Faulds
Allen Biaggi
Tori Sundheim

CALL TO ORDER

Richard DeLong called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM

ROLL CALL

All commissioners in attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Flag presentation by Bishop Manogue

COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC – Pursuant to N.R.S. 241, this time is devoted to comments by the public, if any, and discussion of those comments. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item on the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on a successive agenda and identified as an item for possible action. All public comments will be limited to 5 minutes for each person.
ACTION WILL NOT BE TAKEN

Richard DeLong: asked for any public comments.

John Snow: Mentioned that this is the 30 year anniversary of geothermal production. Brass ingots were made to commemorate the anniversary. The dies were passed around. Ingots are available to purchase from the NBMG website.

I. MINUTES

- A. Approval of the August 27, 2015 meeting minutes

ACTION TAKEN: Dennis Bryan moved to approve the August 27, 2015 meeting minutes. Arthur Henderson seconded the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.

II. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Update on Sage Grouse issues in Nevada as they pertain to mining.
Allan Biaggi

Allen Biaggi: from NvMA provided a PowerPoint presentation.

He gave an overview of the sage grouse. Largest of the six grouse species are in North America. They eat primarily sagebrush, but also insects and other plants. Department of Wildlife gives tours during mating season. The sage grouse is present in 11 western states, with Nevada and Wyoming having the most. He mentioned that habitat mapping is a big issue associated with the sage grouse. Northern 2/3 of Nevada has the most habitat. The ideal habitat would be only sagebrush and little to no juniper or pinyon or other elevated perches. Need very little disturbance during mating. Sage grouse numbers were quite large in 1930's, then declined significantly, but recently numbers are up in 2015. Threats to the population in NV are wildfire, invasive species, and juniper and pinyon encroachment. In Nevada, mining's footprint is less than 170,000 acres... out of 71,000,000 acres. We've had afternoons where that many acres were destroyed by wildfire. Major threat in all states is regulatory control. Amend land use plans and can develop through the NEPA process. Governor Sandoval established the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council which worked to develop the Nevada Greater Sage Grouse Conservation Plan. They are working on a conservation plan to include no exclusion zones. Use economic drivers to protect critical habitat, use the credit mitigation system. Improper grazing, predators, and wild horse/burro are a problem. Final LUPA/EIS for Nevada and Eastern California. The federal government did not include the Nevada Conservation Credit System in the LUPA. Also, certain daily and seasonal time restrictions were put in place. Withdrawal from mineral entry was included for 2.7 million acres along the northern border. A 3% anthropogenic disturbance cap was put into place. Wildfires are considered anthropogenic.

Richard DeLong: will you touch on the travel restrictions?

Allen Biaggi: not a lot, because they're still up in the air.

Richard DeLong: it looks like for areas without a travel management plan, then those areas will actually be closed to OHV use, which affects exploration.

Allen Biaggi: Mining exploration is taking the biggest hit in the LUPA decision. There is a 2 year segregation period with the option for a 2 year extension. This does not impact valid existing rights. The purpose is to gather

information on the area for a final withdrawal decision (20 year period). The largest segregation areas are along the Oregon and Idaho borders.

What is a valid mining claim? Defined in FSM2800, Chapter 2810- Mining Claims.

SEE POWERPOINT FOR DESCRIPTION

Litigation- In Nevada suits filed by AEMA, NACO, Nevada Mineral Resource Alliance and FIM Corp., and in a separate action Elko and Eureka Counties, Western Exploration and Quantum Minerals.

Richard DeLong: AEMA has not entered the Nevada lawsuit.

Dennis Bryan: Nye, Humboldt and Washoe counties have joined.

Allen Biaggi: Litigation outcome: may result in a stay, remand the decision back to USFWS, reconsider the LUPA/EIS, or overturn the listing decision. If it was overturned then it affects all 11 states.

Dave Parker: Asked how does it affect the control if it goes to USFWS?

Allen Biaggi: Stated it would be huge. You would have to have all approval through the USFWS. With the listing, the travel restriction and caps will probably not go away.

Art Henderson: Asked what is Canada doing in the area of sage grouse

Allen Biaggi: Responded that Canada has extracted themselves from the process. Laws are less stringent.

Art Henderson: Stated, where the mining laws are more favorable.

Allen Biaggi: Stated that the bird is still being hunted, which from a perspective standpoint is odd.

Art Henderson: Asked if the American Indians are exempt.

Allen Biaggi: Responded that they are not. PJ encroachment is an acknowledged concern for sage grouse habitat but they have tribal and historical interest in the pinyon pines. They have a conflict in land use.

John Snow: Stated that geothermal as well as mining is being affected. They will allow leasing but you can't get to it. Valid existing rights? How does the exchange work?

Allen Biaggi: Regarding the credit mitigation system that was put in place. If you're going to disturb one acre of habitat, then you have to evaluate that acre and mitigate it. The system, tells you how much land you need to mitigate for that disturbance. Ranging from 1:1 all the way up to 756:1. For example: if you remove pinyon juniper on the land, then you can receive a credit for improvement. It's a banking system. An effort is being made to bring federal lands into the banking system. There is no long term improvement plan with restrictions because of multiple use concepts. Mitigation takes a long time to come up with good sage grouse habitat, 15-20 years.

John Mudge: Asked if they list it will LUPA go away? We heard about improved fire management. Is firefighting in either plan?

Allen Biaggi: Answered yes. But they can take components out to use if they want. Firefighting is in the Nevada plan. The Division of Forestry is putting helicopters in Elko area, which is a great improvement. Federal agencies, in the past, when there is a sage brush fire and timber fires, the timber fires would get priority. Now, they are starting to realize the sage brush is just as important.

Dennis Bryan: Asked for some clarification on the credit system. He gave a personal example from his company.

Allen Biaggi: Stated, that your project is definitely a worst case scenario. The credit mitigation system is a complex/complicated process. Right now there is no mitigation system, so you are at the whim of the Federal agency.

Richard DeLong: Asked how he would feel if it was overturned.

Allen Biaggi: Nevada will have to consider the other 11 states.

Dennis Bryan: Asked what is the position of NvMA?

Allen Biaggi: Stated that they are still trying to understand the LUPA and still evaluating.

B. Nevada Land Withdrawals from Mineral Entry
Presentation of historical land withdrawals by Dennis Bryan

Dennis Bryan: Provided a Power Point presentation.

Nevada Statistics were given: Became Territory of the United States in 1848 as part of the Treaty with Mexico following the Mexican-American War. Part of Utah Territory originally then became Nevada Territory in 1860. Established as the 36th state of the Union October 31, 1864 – Population @ 50,000. Total Area: 70,264,000 acres, 7th largest state. The federal government (includes Indian Reservations) manages the vast majority of land (85%) in the state of Nevada. County and city lands were included in “Private Land”.

Mineral withdrawals since 2012: Basin & Range National Monument -700,000 acres
Yerington Wilderness Area – 45,000 acres, Pine Forest Wilderness-23,000 acres
Pending Mineral Withdrawals: Carson District RMP proposed withdrawals - 470,000 acres
Gold Butte proposed withdrawal- 350,000 acres (includes some previous withdrawals)
Sagebrush Focal Area/Priority Habitat- 2,800,000 acres + additional acres of de-facto restrictions
Southern Nevada Renewable Energy Withdrawal

He presented a chart that depicts the decrease in available federal/state lands by decade. Since 1930, approximately 1,650,000 acres of land are withdrawn every 10 years from mining use. By 2060, at the current trend, almost half of the state will be withdrawn from mining use leaving less than 40 million acres available.

If this continues, the ability to explore and mine on public land will dramatically diminish. No longer going to be a mineral friendly state.

Arthur Henderson: Asked what can be done? Can it be reversed?

Dennis Bryan: Answered that this is just for presentation of this information.

Jim Faulds: Said we are happy to update maps. BLM has been in touch with state geologist in Utah and in the background there is a possibility they will be funded to study mineral potential of proposed land withdrawal. We will receive funding maybe next year. Study would occur next year and be in time to make recommendations. We are already mapping the mineral deposits, but we can do a much more detailed job in the near future.

C. Discussion of the Nevada and NE California Greater Sage Grouse Land Use Plan Amendment and the 2014 Nevada Greater Sage Grouse Conservation Plan (State Plan).

Richard DeLong: Stated that this is on the agenda to possibly pass on our recommendation to the Governor. What should we do, if anything, and what form should they take?

Bryan Stockton: Mentioned that this is not a voting item. For discussion only.

Dennis Bryan: This has serious negative economic implications to the state, particularly in the rural counties. Asked how can we cohabitate with the sage grouse?

John Snow: Stated, the only budget item stated by BLM/FS is for fighting fire, they seem very understaffed. I don't think they have the people and resources to study and develop and put forward best science and practices.

Richard DeLong: Stated that Allen Biaggi made some good points. I always thought the land use plans was very restrictive and wonder if listing isn't more workable.

John Mudge: Mentioned that many of us have gone through the endangered species process. It's a long process but, you can work through it.

Richard DeLong: Stated that the desert tortoise is a good example.

David Parker: Mentioned that the spotted owl as an example of how listing doesn't work as well.

Richard DeLong: Stated that he didn't think there is much to negotiate on a land use decision.

David Parker: Suggested that a law suit stops the negotiations.

Richard Perry: He said that currently we are working with NBMG with an updated set of maps. They will have all the mining districts. So there is potential for comments for the withdrawal. Governor's office had a number of us in on Tuesday, and we put together of a list where this is not working. One of them being Ormat at Tungsten Mountain, which has an existing EA. There is confusion within the BLM and what appears lacking is a logical path forward, like you would have if it were listed

Dennis Bryan: Mentioned that our job is to advise the Governor. We should formulate something to back the mining community.

Richard Perry: Stated that you did that with your letter in July.

Richard DeLong: Asked, what is the regulatory environment after LUPA is stayed? Is there a way to provide recommendations on what that might look like?

John Mudge: Asked, has anyone taken the approach that the maps need to be drawn differently to really focus on what true habitat there really is?

Richard Perry: Stated, yes, our Department of Wildlife. They have developed detailed lek maps. You could gather more birds in just 25% of all the land in the habitat management areas if you just focused on where the birds are.

Richard DeLong: Stated, at one of the SEC meetings Amy Lueders alluded to the fact that the maps are essentially cast in stone and while there may be some potential minor administrative changes, only changing the LUPA could change the boundaries.

Richard DeLong suggested a task group: Dennis Bryan, John Snow, Richard DeLong and Richard Perry. Bring back findings to commission.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Education, Public Awareness and Eagle Scout Service Project Presentation
Bill Durbin and Lucia Patterson

Bill Durbin and Lucia Patterson: provided a PowerPoint presentation.

Lucia Patterson: Mentioned that she had asked teachers at the workshop why specifically those in Douglas County were not calling for presentations? She was told that each activity that is presented needed to have a core standard education description along with the activity. She stated that all the activities needed to be updated to include the core standards. She went through an example for 3rd and 4th grade that goes along with the core standards.

Bill Durbin: Did an update on McCaw classroom, Spring Mountain Ranch State Park presentations. Eagle Scouts Service Projects- to date 160 projects have been completed – 725 hazards have been secured, 143 previously secured hazards have been re-secured.

Dennis Bryan: Asked if Bill did Scout projects in the North?

Bill Durbin: Answered that Rob Ghiglieri does them in the North.

Nick Potter: Introduced himself to the commission. He stated that he worked at Hycroft for a short time. He is looking forward to working with everyone in the department.

Richard Perry: Mentioned that he is being trained for Lowell's back up as well.

B. NDOM Forecast and Reserve balance - Mike Visher

Mike Visher: He presented spreadsheets and graphs of the Forecast and Reserve.

John Snow: Stated that you based the budget on a 5% decline, now it's 7%.

Mike Visher: Stated that's correct. This is a more realistic number. And I don't see the decrease in number of mining claims stabilizing, based on what we've seen today.

Arthur Henderson: Asked that the fee's we approved today will be an extra \$70,000 or so if we do?

Mike Visher: Stated yes and Rich will be going through that.

C. Findings of task force to review NDOM budget and forecast.
At the August 27th CMR meeting, Chairman DeLong assigned a task force to review the budget and forecast. The task force will present findings.

Richard Perry: Stated that the task force met just last week on the 28th here in Reno for fee increases and operating costs. They did a forecast assumptions based on a 7% decrease. He wanted to note that AML contracted work has declined significantly to \$60,000/year for FY16-17. We went from 8 interns to 6 interns. There was also one vehicle replacement in 2017.

He went on to discuss Findings, stating that further cuts in activity/staffing/program activities will jeopardize the Division's ability to fulfill its statutory requirements and remain in compliance with the last Legislative audit. Options for raising revenues are: OGG fee increase, increase mining claim fee to \$10/claim (currently \$8.50) and increase the surface disturbance fee for new or amended P.O.O. to \$30 per acre statutory cap (currently at \$20).

Richard DeLong: Stated that as I see it at the end of this FY we should be right at the \$750,000 reserve guidance mark. At the end of next FY it is significantly less. We need some discussion and then agreement on a path forward.

Dennis Bryan: Stated that we need to seriously consider raising the claim fee.

Arthur Henderson: Mentioned that the \$1.50 increase is less than 1% increase.

Richard DeLong: Said he talked to Dana Bennett at the NvMA about this increase and she was not surprised. Half the claims are mining operators. I've not spoken to the exploration community.

Dennis Bryan: Stated that he spoke with Dave Shaddrick at NMEC and he's not for it as exploration is down.

John Mudge: Stated that a 7% drop in claims might not happen, but we need to be prudent. But, we have to do something. I'm more supportive of \$1.50 as opposed to the surface disturbance increase. I think we need to demonstrate to the industry that we've taken a hard look at cuts. How hard did we look at the spending side?

Richard Perry: Responded that we have looked at mostly at donations and special projects and the sagebrush ecosystem council funding. We have scaled that back and that's how we have managed these past 2 years. We scaled back on AML contract work and vehicle replacement. What we have here is salary and overhead. In addition, furloughs were lifted just this past July which then increases our personnel costs.

Arthur Henderson: Stated that we took a hard look at head count and salary and NDOM is already at the bare minimum we can have to function. Personnel is 50% of all costs, operating costs have already been reduced. Not much left to cut.

John Snow: Mentioned that the 2 commodities (oil and geothermal) have been out of whack for a while and is now down as with gold and silver prices. The mining claim fee could be reduced if necessary in the future.

Fred Gibson: Had mentioned, yes we have the ability to reduce the claim fee as needed.

Richard Perry: Stated that if need be we can show the reduction in fees. Most of the extra cost was in special projects and donations, and AML contracting.

John Snow: Mentioned that when you look at senior status, and retirement, there should be a lowering of costs when bringing on new people at a lower cost. There should be some savings there, a thin line.

David Parker: Asked, last time we raised claim fees was in 2008?

Richard Perry: Stated, yes that was for the Mackay payment. Prior to that the last fee increase was 1999.

John Snow: Asked realistically when will the increase in claim fees be seen in revenue?

Richard Perry: Answered Fiscal 2017. By January 2016 we should have a true picture of claim fee revenue for fiscal 2016..

Richard DeLong: Stated that we need to start this very soon if we are going to increase this fee in time to affect fiscal 2017.

David Parker: Stated that 16 years to increase the fees is far too long. We should increase the claim fees.

Art Henderson: Stated, we should increase the surface disturbance fee to \$30, and then we can look at truck when the time comes and approve the findings of the task force.

John Mudge: Asked if will there be further discussion in section D?

Richard DeLong: Answered yes, and this is only to approve the task force findings.

ACTION TAKEN: Arthur Henderson moved to approve all the findings of the task force. David Parker seconded the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- D. Mining Claim Fees and Surface Disturbance Fee.
The mining claim fee task force presented findings to the Commission at the December 11, 2014 meeting. At that meeting, the Commission chose to delay any action on increasing claim fees until after oil/gas and geothermal regulation changes and fees were completed, or early 2016. The current Dangerous Condition in Non-Operating mine fee was last set by the Commission in May, 2008, at \$2.50 per claim, with a statutory cap of \$4.00 per claim (NRS 513.094). The claim filing fee, per NAC 517.200, is currently at \$6 per claim filing, last set by the Commission in May, 2008, with a statutory cap of \$6 per claim (NRS 517.185). The Commission can direct the Division to begin rule-making to increase the Dangerous Condition in Non-Operating Mines fee. The fee for approved surface disturbance on public lands is currently \$20 per acre (NAC 519A.634) with a statutory cap of \$30 per acre (NRS 519A.250). This fee was last adjusted by the Commission in 1999. The Commission can direct the Division to begin rule-making to increase the Surface Disturbance fee. By statute, this fee must be used for AML hazard securing and education of the general public concerning the dangers of AML hazards.

Richard Perry: He read the action item into record. The commission previously directed the Division to complete regulations for oil/gas and geothermal before discussing the mining claim fees.

Arthur Henderson: Said if we were to raise the surface disturbance fee from \$20 to \$30, it would be a \$45,000 increase to the base in FY 2017. And a \$1.50 increase would give us an extra \$242,000.

John Snow: Asked, how do you model the surface disturbance fee?

Mike Visher: State that the surface disturbance fee is hard to forecast. We look at the permits that are going to be approved or ones that are in the queue. Once the P.O.O. is approved they have to pay. The staged expansions are also tough to project. About \$190,000 coming in FY16 and 17, based on what's in the queue.

John Mudge: Asked how much did Mt. Hope/General Moly pay?

Mike Visher: Answered \$160,000. They can get a refund if they do a plan amendment. But they only get a small fraction of the \$20 back.

John Mudge: Stated that he didn't feel good about increase funding on the back of other programs.

Mike Visher: Mentioned that the initial AML program was just an inventory effort. This fee provides dedicated revenue to do securing work. And fund contractor work. That's what it's tied to.

Dennis Bryan: Asked if this includes all P.O.O., what about notice level?

Mike Visher: Explained no, this is just for a plan on public land, regardless of size. It does not touch notice

level on BLM. It's approved disturbance on public land. NDEP does a great job tracking it to the 1/10th of an acre. We maintain a database to track this acreage.

Dennis Bryan: Stated that this will be a double whammy to the exploration people if you raise claim fees and surface disturbance fees.

Arthur Henderson: Stated that Richard DeLong made a good point. The \$1.50 fee increase alone gets us to where we need to be. He said they should only consider the one.

John Mudge: Said he agreed. Let's just go after the one that gets us to where we want to be.

Richard Perry: Said that we can make some talking points to provide industry. This next year we will be in good shape, but for FY-17 we will have a decision to make, raise fees or let go of the Mackay payment.

David Parker: Asked if we raise it this year, then we have to raise it again the year after?

Richard Perry: Answered no. You can direct staff to begin rulemaking on the fee increase, with the goal of getting it done by June next year. The \$1.50 fee increase impacts FY-17.

ACTION TAKEN: John Mudge moved to approve the claim fee increase by \$1.50 and direct staff to begin rulemaking. Fred Gibson seconded the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- E. Findings of task force to evaluate regulations changes to NAC 513.
At the August 27th CMR meeting, a task force was formed by Commissioner DeLong to review possible changes to NAC 513 that relate to definitions of abandoned mine lands (AML) securing fences, AML rankings, AML warning signs and periods of notification of AML hazards. The task force will present findings to the CMR, which may choose to direct the Division to move forward with developing language to begin rule-making.

Bill Durbin: Said he was filling in for Rob Ghiglieri. The regulations have not been changed since 1988. As the program has evolved the language needs to be updated. The task force found definitions 513.260 of fences and enclosures. 5A excludes barbed wire fences, yet we use barbed wire fences for all our enclosures. We suggest striking 513.260. See the added blue italic on 5A.

Dennis Bryan: Asked if the ranking can be lowered as well?

Bill Durbin: Answered that it has to be a ranking between 1-5, at the discretion of the person doing the ranking. There should be a description of the location on the sheet when in the field.

John Mudge: Asked if you have a rating based on location and danger? You are just adding that same language to location?

Bill Durbin: Stated that there have been concerns by a number of people in remote areas. We now have a lot of ATV trails and motorbikes, and have a potential due to location for a higher hazard.

In 513.370, we would like to change language for posting warning signs. "Mounted on an orange post" we struck that from the regulation. Changed to, "in a prominent location near the hazard".

In 513.390, the period after notification to secure dangerous condition. Language has been struck though 1-4. Re-written in blue.

David Parker: Mentioned that administrator has a small “a”. in the previous lines it is a capital “A”.

Richard Perry: Said that LCB legal will take care of the correct usage.

Dennis Bryan: Stated that this is very simplified. From a legal point of view, if someone gets hurt, couldn't we be in trouble with signage? Should there be minimums that we put on this?

Bryan Stockton: Stated that there will always be an argument. Someone is always going to sue and these will not protect you from everything. But these are adequate and cover all the necessary needs. Requiring a minimum distance for sign location may be very difficult due to the terrain.

John Mudge: Stated minimal, low and high hazard. In all of these we post a sign within 30 days. In 513.380 it states 180 days. And then in 513.390 all it indicates is that you have to do is post a sign.

Mike Visher: Clarified that the practice we have been doing is now matching the standards for our securing with the new language. Minimals were never specifically addressed before. It does not currently say that posting of a minimal is a securing. Posting of a sign has since 1989 been considered to be sufficient, but it wasn't addressed in current regulations.

John Mudge: Asked where does the notification come from?

Richard DeLong: Stated that the Division of Minerals sends the notifications out.

Arthur Henderson: Stated that the orange sign tells me “danger”. I would hate to change the color when people are already used to seeing it.

ACTION TAKEN: Dennis Bryan moved to approve the task force recommendations on the language changes to NAC 513 and direct staff to begin rulemaking. David Parker seconded the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. STAFF REPORTS

Mining/Reclamation Bond Pool – Mike Visher

Mike Visher: Bond pool is healthy, with a little more activity in the bond pool but largely due to reductions in bond amounts.

Oil, Gas, and Geothermal – Lowell Price (Oil and geothermal drilling update)

Lowell Price: Stated that this year we have permitted 10 geothermal industrial wells. Last year we had 10 observation permits. Only 2 geothermal companies are active- USG Nevada and Ormat. Oil permits issued are running 75% lower than last year. Once Noble slowed their activity, this affected our permit application volume. Bright Sky Energy currently drilling in White River valley. Well inspections are at about 67% of total wells to be inspected in fiscal 2016.

Administrator's report- Rich

Richard Perry: Went over budget, reserve balance right now is \$1.3M. Discussed completion of MOU with NDEP for oil, gas, and geothermal.

Correspondence –

Richard Perry: discussed a Bill which Congressman Hardy asked him to comment on. December 14th meeting to

be held at Colorado School of Mines.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

A. Determination of time and place of next CMR meeting

Las Vegas - Possible tour at Blue Diamond gypsum mine or Simplot silica mine.

CMR -Wednesday, February 3rd 1-5, tour on Thursday, February 4th.

COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Pursuant to N.R.S. 241, this time is devoted to comments by the public, if any, and discussion of those comments. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item on the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on a successive agenda and identified as an item for possible action. All public comments will be limited to 5 minutes for each person. **ACTION WILL NOT BE TAKEN**

Alan Coyner- Stated that the funds going to Mackay are not considered donations. Mining claimants are transferring money from the mining community. That \$2 is not really Division money. Russ is not here to say it but, that has moved \$3.2 million to Mackay in 7 years and for that Mackay has received \$4.5 million from the Marigold royalty. We had to increase the claim fee 2 times within 2 years when I was administrator with NDOM. The \$1.50 shouldn't be a hard sell. He suggested several meetings with the mining community by the commission. The exploration people should be receptive if the approach is good. The fee increase is overdue.

John Snow: Mentioned past geothermal commissioners that contributed to the success of the geothermal program. Under the leadership of Commissioner Gibson, public servants Ross de Lipkau, Frank Yeamans, and Patrick Fagan donated their time to the Commission. Just wanted to acknowledge them.

ADJOURNMENT

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:33 PM.