

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/



Las Vegas Office: 375 E. Warm Springs Rd. #205, Las Vegas, NV 89119 Phone: (702) 486-4343; Fax: (702) 486-4345

Thursday, May 19, 2022 1:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Commissioners	Staff	Public
Josh Nordquist	Mike Visher	Jim Faulds, NBMG Director via Zoom
Mary Korpi	Rob Ghiglieri	Allison Combs, Governor's Office via Zoom
Art Henderson	Sherrie Nuckolls	
Bob Felder	Rebecca Ely via Zoom	
Nigel Bain	Garrett Wake via Zoom	
Stephanie Hallinan	Anthony Walsh, DAG via Zoom	
Randy Griffin		

CALL TO ORDER

1:00 PM

COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Mike Visher announced Rebecca Ely is resigning from Division of Minerals to pursue education, he thanked her for all her contributions to the Division, especially all the classroom presentations and outreach. She presented at 175 classrooms and outreach events since she started January 2, 2019. That's reaching over 21,000 people which is quite an accomplishment, she's also been instrumental in advancing the STEAM mining education course. Her last day is June 10, 2022, and we have some challenges to fill her shoes in Las Vegas especially with what's she's done in the classrooms and her activities and wiliness to create educational videos at home.

Rebecca Ely: Thanked Mike for the kind words and to the Commission on Mineral Resources and the entire team at NDOM. She stated she had a wonderful opportunity working with a great set of people and she's experienced a lot of professional and personal growth. One thing she's learned while working at NDOM is she's very passionate about education and educating people on Earth Science topics and mining in our community. Clark County is suffering from a massive teacher shortage, and she feels like that's a gap she can fill and bring her scientific knowledge into the classroom and continue providing minerals education.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Becky, thank you for everything you've done for the Division, the State and we look forward to seeing you in other avenues. Best of luck.

Rebecca Ely: Thank you.

AGENDA

A. Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda made by: Bob Felder

Nigel Bain; Large-Scale Mining Robert Felder; Exploration and Development Randy Griffin; Small-Scale Mining and Prospecting **Commission on Mineral Resources**

Stephanie Hallinan; Large-Scale Mining Art Henderson; Oil and Gas Mary Korpi; Public at Large

Josh Nordquist, Chairman; Geothermal Resources

Page 2 of 13

Seconded by: Randy Griffin Unanimously approved

II. MINUTES

A. Approval of the March 10, 2022, quarterly meeting minutes

Motion to approve the March 10, 2022, minutes made by: Mary Korpi

Seconded by: Nigel Bain Unanimously approved

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. NBMG Special Project Proposals

Jim Faulds thanked the Commission for considering the requests and gave a brief description of the Report on the 3D Stratigraphy, Structure, and Fluid Flow Regime of the Soda Lake Geothermal Field in Fallon, Nevada, that was previously considered by the Commission at the March 11. 2021 meeting, with a total cost of \$40,000. Next, he explained the new project proposals including the Mining District Files: Digitizing for Universal Access with a budget estimate of \$35,400 plus UNR now has a 10% indirect charge on any projects funded by other State agencies.

Rob Ghiglieri: Did it change from 8% recently?

Jim Faulds: It was 0% if we go back 5 years, then briefly it was 8% and now it's 10%.

Rob Ghiglieri: Okay.

Bob Felder: Asked over what period of time did this (mining district files) backlog accumulate.

<u>Jim Faulds</u>: We have tons of mining district files, it's just a matter of once we came into the digital age so folks can access them through the website instead of coming into the building and looking at them. I think it's a combination of recent donations and also files that we haven't had time to digitize yet but have been in the office for decades, we've slowly been digitizing what we have since the mid 2000's.

Bob Felder: Thanks.

Jim Faulds then explained the Earth Science Week Field Trip Publications project with a budget estimate of \$18,000.

Art Henderson: If we don't fund this will these activities still continue?

<u>Jim Faulds</u>: The Earth Science field trip would still happen; we just wouldn't have the resources to take these and make some of the nifty products.

Randy Griffin: On an average how many people attend these field trips?

<u>Jim Faulds</u>: We've had over 100 on some of these field trips, because of the pandemic they didn't run for a year or two. The field trip this last spring I believe there was 70-75 attendees. These field trips were very popular in the past, one of our major forms of outreach and attracts all kinds of folks from the community. It's a great informative way to educate Nevada citizens about our fantastic geologic setting along with our wealth of mineral resources, geothermal resources and so on.

Jim Faulds mentioned the third project, Catalogue of Mineral Resources and Reserves, will need to hold off as the project lead, John Muntean, is busy with other projects at this time. They would like to reconsider it in a year or two.

Josh Nordquist: Asked if both the first two projects are potentially in FY24 and the third one will be FY23.

Jim Faulds: The third project would be in FY23-FY24.

Page 3 of 13

Jim Faulds had to leave the meeting and thanked the Commission for considering their requests. Mike Visher let Jim Fauld know that the Commission will be hearing over the next hour or so and then they'll make discissions on funding any of those at the end of the meeting. Mike told Jim that he would update him with the results of the meeting.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Unless there's any other discussion on these ones for now, we can discuss the funding later towards the end.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: My comment is when we came up with this idea of having these special reports, I think they're more reports instead of funding for field trips, I think the field trips are a good idea, but it doesn't necessarily fall into this category of what we try to achieve, especially reports, these reports are something that are hard copy documents that many people can review.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: Just to clarify that field trips are not a part of the funding it would just be the production of an enhanced version of what took place on the trip in a digital sense, interactive on the website. Story maps can be downloaded, and teachers can use that in the classrooms.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: So, they can go on the field trip virtually?

Mike Visher: Yes.

Rob Ghiglieri: Or they can go and use their phone as a guide.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: We use these story maps in the workshops for some of the field trips. They're very engaging and allow for the user to jump off and explore other components that's of their interests, it links to other websites, projects, publications. It's really kind of a classroom field trip component and then distilling down into segments and then you can do it virtually or download it on your phone and actually re-do it in the field on your own. They do have a lot of families that attend these field trips, and this would give them the ability to do it anytime they chose to. The field trips themselves, there's no funding for those.

Josh Nordquist: So, a report of the field trips?

Mike Visher: Yes, that is pertinent to the Division's mission.

Art Henderson: \$35,000 to digitize decades of data or \$18,000 to digitize a field trip?

Mike Visher: On the digitizing of the data set, so the Bureau has been the recipient for decades of boxes and boxes of scientific documents from geologists, not just here in Nevada. But with regards to Nevada geology projects as the files comes in, they're briefly inventoried, but until there is money set aside to scan, they just sit there. Then if a company says I want all the documents you have on the National district. I'll pay you \$20,000 to scan everything you've got, so I don't have to do it myself. The Bureau would then scan all the stuff for the National district but that's it. So, it's really as the funds come in and they're dedicated towards a certain area or even a certain person's collection. This is one of the projects that provides dividends on a number of fronts. We use it all the time for our abandoned mine lands program to do research on historic workings in an area. There's a lot of underground mapping that's been done by private individuals, companies and they're sitting in boxes and that would help us determine how we're going to close these things or what connections there are. Then also for explorers to understand what's been done before in this district so they don't have to reinvent the wheel. From a mineral potential standpoint and for resource management plans they become useful for the BLM and the counties to decide is there something valuable in this region that we may be losing if you set it aside for conservation. It's a really worthwhile project and provides a lot of information that will reap dividends for decades; it's one of our go-to resources. It's a low-cost high return investment from my perspective.

Nigel Bain: Are the Teacher's workshop field trips gaining that kind of interest?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: It depends on how it's served up but yes. That's where the Bureau does a good job trying to educate the public with resources and then getting them out. They do have field trip guidebooks for areas. We provide road logs for

Page 4 of 13

the teachers' workshops where we have a bus of teachers, and we want to give them everything we can about everything they're seeing on the way to their destination. These have evolved into story maps. Since you're already pulling all of this together, let's put it all together in a nice visually informative but engaging digital format online that can be downloaded, and you can view it on your phone in the field.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: Can't you google these things right now and get the same information?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: No, it's not the same. Part of it is you have scientist's pulling information together and then making it understandable for the layperson. Making it easy for them to understand and so that it resonates with them. Is this something the Bureau could pursue on their own, absolutely.

B. 2022 AML Summer Intern Program Overview

Sean Derby asked the 6 interns to introduce and tell a little about themselves. Sean then went over the goals and plans for the 14-week program including revisits, securings, and inventorying sites.

Mike Visher: It's going to be a lot of travel.

Sean Derby: Yes, it is.

Josh Nordquist: Thank you everyone for your dedication, please be safe out there and don't get lost.

Randy Griffin: What is a hard closure?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: Typically, what we're doing is temporary closures with fencing, so hard closures are backfill, foam closure, filling it with foam and then backfill on top, or a bat compatible gate or grate or cupula. The hard closures require a mini NEPA process, so archaeology has to be involved, biology has to be involved before the BLM field office can sign off on that. There's a lot of coordination with the BLM that has to occur in advance and sometimes the closure type dictates when you can do it. Typically, most of the bat compatible closures have to be done typically in the fall and some backfills as well. It's a slower process but hopefully it becomes more permanent.

Josh Nordquist explained the next three items on the agenda we are going to review a few new proposals then plan for the budget so that's when we'll go through the approval process. Commissioners, just for your information, we'll save any decisions on any of these items until the end.

C. The McCaw School of Mines Exhibit Proposal

Garrett Wake gave a background of the McCaw School of Mines and went over an in-kind donation request of the exhibit proposal which is a life size projection system and a video to go along with it to portray aspects of modern mining in our society, see attached presentation.

<u>Mary Korpi</u>: Nigel and I were around when all of this took off, mining companies were behind that effort, and it never would have happened without the mining companies. I assume you still have reps from the mining companies on the board, are they supportive? Have you picked up that they think this is a good way to go? I suspect some of their support will be critical too, in as much as the filming of this because you're going to have access to the operations.

<u>Garrett Wake</u>: Yes, we do have board members who are a part of the mining industry, we have representation from Kinross on the board right now, we had a Newmont representative before the merger and hoping we can add to that. We haven't had a board meeting since this proposal has come up other than we've discussed at past meetings our #1 priority is adding to the mine and updating it and so this exact project to the entire board hasn't been pitched but it is part of what our Executive Director has been looking into in making upgrades. In terms of reaching out to the mines we've reached out to Nevada Gold Mines and plan to reach out to others and they were receptive, we haven't received a yes or no yet, but that was the first avenue we went down was to get some video of an underground drift and

Page **5** of **13**

obviously being the largest miner in that regard to the State, we reached out to them first so we're still waiting to hear back on if and when that would be possible.

<u>Mary Korpi</u>: I know that education is a real hot button for Nevada Gold Mines, I think it may take some time to work through that system, but I would not be discouraged, I'd keep going.

<u>Stephanie Hallinan</u>: I'm curious, when you were reaching out to folks who did the videos, Ken Eurick still visits the mining companies to create exactly these kinds of videos. He's out of Montana and I know he's still connected to doing this sort of thing and he's been doing them for about 20-30 years and he's a very good resource. We used him for our environmental video for training and such. We have some reclamation out at Bald Mountain which is really good, and he'll have footage of that so there's maybe a resource there with Ken.

Garrett Wake: We haven't and since this would be facilitated through the Division as an in-kind donation, we would have to send this project out to bid, if it was approved by the Commission. We'd definitely have the ability to include anyone we want on the distribution list, and I would really appreciate any contact information you have on that. Piggybacking on that a little more, we do anticipate there is video available, we really want to focus on the highest quality life like video that we can get. We really want to bring people into seeing the mine not just showing it on a TV but try to bring them into the environment. We also started doing public days about two years ago, one day a month and that's really opened a lot of doors for us as well. Instead of just the 4th grade students, which we have not decreased on that, we've added a public day and we receive probably 250 or so on average visitors a month just on one day. When funding becomes available, we plan on expanding that to an additional day or two or more if possible. We do get a significant amount of people that are just general public in southern Nevada that are interested in learning about mining, and I wanted to mention that as well.

Randy Griffin: You should try and contact Darren Wilson with Lhoist, Director of Human Resources, they put videos all the time on LinkedIn. I don't know what they can do for you, if you want to get some money or not, produce videos since they're in Las Vegas, Darren used to work at Kinross and he's sympathetic to this type of thing.

<u>Garrett Wake</u>: That would be fantastic, I'll follow up with you on that and again the hope is bringing this to fruition should be a big selling point for us in expanding going forward adding. Maybe eventually in time instead of having one video there we have 5 or 10 to choose from.

<u>Randy Griffin</u>: One last comment, Lhoist's videos have supported schools around the world as they're a worldwide company, whether they want to do it here in Nevada I don't know.

Garrett Wake: Thank you.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Is the proposal to see if the Commission would pay for some or all or both, is there a preferred path here?

<u>Garrett Wake</u>: The two proposals, one is a non-3D and the other one is a 3D, we initially inquired about the 3D was a little more expensive. When you have 4th grade kids something like that could really add to the interest level of bringing people in, so we wanted to offer that if that amount of funding was available or able to be considered. Otherwise, I think the intent would be met very well at the \$50K funding level, just going with high-definition video. There may be routes in there also as many of you have mentioned to already attain footage that may have been captured recently and is high quality. We could maybe look towards other places to highlight reclamation, or jobs, or anything, we would look towards ideas and use that funding towards continuing develop content.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: You said you reached out to other industry stake holders for example, are there other commitments for this so far?

<u>Garrett Wake</u>: We've reached out to Nevada Gold Mines and there's not a commitment yet. But they have made a commitment to us in terms of funding other things so I think this is something that we will continue to work with them

Page 6 of 13

on. Other than that, on this specific project, no, but on a broader view we have been reaching out on other projects to community partners and other mining companies to work on those. A virtual mine tour for example, we recently updated our website, so we've been hitting other upgrades as well this is kind of a multi-pronged approach, and this is the one that was developed for the Commission to consider.

<u>Nigel Bain</u>: I think you've got to get money out of Nevada Gold Mines, like Mary Korpi commented, McCaw has managed to stay ahead of itself with the backing of the different mining companies. I gather Kinross is still involved with it, that's a good thing.

<u>Garrett Wake</u>: Thank you, just to touch on what you mentioned there, Nevada Gold Mines is our largest financial contributor. They do a lot with us, and they have, over the past year, done a lot of in-kind work as well. They've contributed a few things to the property, and we do have stakeholders that are working on other projects. We will continue to work with them on this, as well as with other mines at getting access at the very least, and hopefully additional video and things like that.

<u>Stephanie Hallinan</u>: What's the proposed timeline on this that they'd like to get this going? Because you mentioned it hadn't been put in front of your Board yet, correct?

<u>Garrett Wake</u>: We will bring it up at the next Board meeting, but the Executive Director has the latitude to implement these things. It's not something we'll have to approve or disapprove; they are aware of it and our onboard, but we haven't met on it officially so the timeline in terms of McCaw. Correct me if I'm wrong Mike, but I think this is budgeted for the next biennium so we wouldn't be able to get started until at the very earliest after this fiscal year and probably later than that. I would hope sometime early next spring or into the summer we would have this completed.

Stephanie Hallinan: Great, thank you.

D. Proposal to add GIS Analyst Position to Agency's FY25/25 Budget Submission

Mike Visher discussed a proposal to add one FTE as an unclassified GIS Analyst as part of the agency's biennial budget submission.

Nigel Bain: Would you be moving Lucia into that new position?

Mike Visher: That's what I would like to do, yes and backfill her Field Specialist position.

E. Proposal to Establish an AML Hard Closure Fund

Mike Visher went over a summary of the proposal to create a new AML expenditure program at the Division pulling money from the reserves to make funding available for local partner government agencies so they could close AML features on their lands.

<u>Stephanie Hallinan</u>: You said there are some mechanisms in place, let's say we put out the \$200K and you get a lot of different counties, do you have the manpower to do that because you have a really good procedure that folks can follow then it's pretty efficient, etc. What are your thoughts on being ready if you get quite a few out there and then they can help accomplish our goal?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: I think we're going to be selective on how we broadcast it at first so that we're not overwhelmed, the hand holding side does take work. Once an entity does it and they learn the way they can do it themselves for the next go around. There are economies of scale if they do certain regions. Some of these are spread out a bit, even on our hard closures that we do now, we do clusters so you're mobilizing the equipment, the personnel for the area. A lot of times the biggest cost is in mobilization, and it depends on the closure type as well and the timing. I think we'll reach out to those who reached out to us or at least got back to us first.

Nigel Bain: What about the University of Nevada?

Page **7** of **13**

Rob Ghiglieri: Their two properties are patented mining claims; one in Washoe County, near Pyramid Lake and the other is in the Wonder District in Churchill County.

Randy Griffin: Since I've driven through Goldfield a dozen times, that landscape looks like a moon, I don't see anything on there in Esmeralda or Goldfield

Mike Visher: That's probably because those properties have been consolidated by just a few landholders.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: The intent is the funds are available and set aside, the counties or whoever the appropriate authority would come to the Commission with their proposals or go to the Division?

Mike Visher: Come to the Division.

Josh Nordquist: So, they can be reviewed for quality of the fix they want to perform?

Mike Visher: Right.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: And approve after that.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: So, we would do an interlocal with that entity to outline what each party is responsible for that they provide back to us in exchange for the money that's facilitating that. Depending on the amount, whether or not it goes to Board of Examiners, but first we'd have to create the capacity in a work program. If the Commission approved this, we'll go forward with a work program then at the next Commission meeting we will come forward with what the program looks like. We want to make it as easy as possibly for the entities to request the monies, if it's not easy and they have to jump through a lot of hoops, they're not going to do it and we don't won't to do all the work either. This is not supposed to increase the work on us because we're maxed out.

Bob Felder: You mentioned the intent for, if the monies are approved, the Division could only handle do you think that's realistic?

Mike Visher: We'll see.

<u>Bob Felder</u>: Do the counties have any expertise at all? Anybody can hire a contractor but I'm just wondering if it's going to impact your staff more than anticipated.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: If they use our existing contractor, through a joinder, it's very easy because he already knows what needs to be done, so that would be the preferred route. That would be the easiest for them, as well as for us. Another option is if they had a partner, a company that wanted to help out and provide the equipment and operator at cost.

<u>Stephanie Hallinan</u>: You'd be already following the normal protocol for mine closure and that's already in place so that's guidance right there.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: Yes, in looking ahead if there was to be some Good Sam legislation this would be opened up to third parties and NGOs that wanted to request funding. And make a partner with the mining agencies to get the work done but without that Good Sam protection they will not move forward, but this program would be for features on private lands where the landowner can perform the work.

F. Strategic Planning Session for Biennial Budget Fiscal Years 2024-25

Rob Ghiglieri reviewed a PowerPoint on the upcoming biennium planning for the budget which included guidelines, steps, goals, and guidance, see attached. Rob asked for input from the Commission, he asked if the Commission wanted NDOM to continue attending trade shows such as AME, AEMA, PDAC, etc. Do you want us to expand the open data website and look for additional ways to educate the public? Continue funding for specific reports NBMG such as Major Mines, mining report, etc.? Do you want us to continue to increase AML hard closure contracted work and prepare for more federal dollar towards that, BIL section 40704? Are the performance Measures adequate? Do you see any more initiatives with CMR that need to be addressed in the next 2 years? That's what we're asking your input on.

Page **8** of **13**

Mike Visher went on to explain how important it is for the Commission to give feedback on the guidelines and goals for the Division at this meeting, especially the projects proposed during that meeting so NDOM can justify continuing the programs as is, or expanding, or reducing for any reason. Mike gave some examples questions to the commission for continuing the NBMG contracts, AML enhancements, Special Projects so they could be used to justify the building of NDOM budget. Mike also gave a background on the performance measures that the Division currently uses and asked if the Commission would like to see them changed.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Maybe easier to ask the opposite question, is anyone opposed NDOM going to PDAC or AEMA? <u>Stephanie Hallinan</u>: I'd be curious to hear what are your thoughts on the advantages to continue attending the Roundups, what are the advantages in your folks' eyes?

Mike Visher explained the benefits of attending these conferences and how they meet the Division's mission. By having a presence at these events, the Division is educating the public and answering questions on mining topics, providing, and disseminating materials and information on Nevada mining.

Randy Griffin: Where are these events at?

Mike Visher: PDAC is in Toronto always, AME Roundup is in Vancouver. Canada is the primary investment place.

Rob Ghiglieri: AEMA which is split, 2 years in Reno 1 year in Spokane and GSN is once every five years.

Mike Visher continued to discuss the NBMG contract and gave his reasoning's on why he believes the Commission should continue the contract. Mike continued by saying "The curation of cuttings it's in our statutes and regulations that fluid mineral companies provide those cuttings but there's no mechanism for funding for the Bureau to process those and that's part of that ask is for some funding for that. Until anything changes with the funding at the Bureau the products that we get, MI report, exploration survey, the maps are all very pertinent to educate the legislators and the public. It's very important to provide timely product to them to show there's mines everywhere, the impact of the industry is this big and it's not just the mining, it's the research and development of exploration and this is a quantification of that, that's all very important."

Bob Felder: if we propose to fund the AML hard closure program out of reserve does that create any optics on getting the budget approved? If these guys have a reserve balance, they can fund new projects and yet they're asking for a bigger budget in the next biennium, how do those two relate?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: That's a great question, when we talked to the Budget Analysts, they didn't seem to have any issues with the reserve. If you have a capacity and it's within your statutory authority to spend it then you're allowed to do that, we've heard nothing about changes to the reserve guidance.

<u>Bob Felder</u>: The agreement with the Bureau is to fund one of those projects every other year so if we fund Soda Lake the other three are no's?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: No, the Soda Lake would be one that could be done outside of the budget process but because it's not going to start until FY24, we will just put it in the budget. Our existing contract is for one special project to be determined by the Commission and that would be proposed at a future meeting probably be in the fall, as it wouldn't actually start until FY24 but the capacity to approve that project is a part of this process.

<u>Nigel Bain</u>: With the Bureau we had the Railroad Valley report, we funded that one I think but the Soda Lake was in the same year.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: We had three initial proposals, the Lithium report, Railroad Valley, and Soda Lake. We did the Lithium report as part of the contract and then we did the Railroad Valley as a special project report, that was all they could do at the time. Soda Lake is now back for consideration for FY24.

Page **9** of **13**

<u>Art Henderson</u>: That's great, we probably would have done all three, but they were too busy so that's why we delayed it.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: I recognize that the need for outreach is something that will continue as well, I wouldn't suggest changing but just note the state's growing and will continue to grow, we can't lose focus on the AML program, and the education program.

Rob Ghiglieri: That and including PDAC and AME.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: In my opinion, anything to get out there both for revenue side of the Division as well as the expense and employee development and any other aspects going along with being exposed to the industry outside of our state is worthwhile.

<u>Nigel Bain</u>: I agree with what Josh is saying and support to add manpower and getting everything in a digital format, probably the one thing we talked about a couple year ago was the drill core of these projects and the problem of storing it all. Somehow the state has to solve that problem, trying to preserve data.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: The Bureau is working towards that. They've applied for additional funding, and they are eventually planning on the expansion of the Gold Building out to the north so that they can house more cuttings and make them available for the public. Ormat's going to be providing more core to the Bureau again and it does create a bind if they don't have the space for it. If it sits out in a container in Stead, that doesn't do anybody any good, but it does create a workload on the Bureau when they bring it in, inventory it properly, scan and categorize it. Every they're going to do to make the information publicly available. They plan on growing that capacity and then it will be up to Emily and Jim to figure out how they can we make that even better.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Back to PDAC, didn't we used to have PDAC spots specifically in the budget expenditures report? <u>Mike Visher</u>: Yes, it is under Special Projects.

<u>Bob Felder</u>: I think the Division is really aligned with the Governor's core functions, I'm curious to see what some of the other departments are like.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: Not all of the agencies check all the boxes, but the programs have to fit in there somewhere within the budget building manual, you have to pick which program with which core function it goes to then you have to explain in text why.

Randy Griffin: So, we'll continue with PDAC and these other ones?

Mike Visher: Yes.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Do we want to suggest any changes to budget decisions and goals set forth in the slide or suggest any changes from the Commission?

<u>Art Henderson</u>: Let's make a vote to support it, because they're very important to the Division to support the Governor's strategic planning core functions. We've spent a lot of time making sure we've done these correctly and I think you've done them correctly.

Nigel Bain: I wonder if you can even do it, you've got Garrett's request for some, can you put that into your budget?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: Yes, if it's something to be funded in FY24 or FY25 and it's something the Commission would like to see done then we would incorporate it into the budget build based on today's discussion and approval.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: As far as actions go, I think the only related other actions are the budget strategy which was what the presentation was, was the additional position.

<u>Mike Visher</u>: Well, so if you look at the budget decisions and CMR discussion we'd like some guidance on bullets 1 through 4, if you agree. Bullet 5 kind of speaks towards the Hard Closure fund establishments, bullet 6 is a separate

Page **10** of **13**

agenda item as well but then bullets 7 and 8, feedback on those would be appreciated now as a part of this agenda item. Does that make sense Tony?

Anthony Walsh: Yes, that does make sense, I do not have a problem with that.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Went through all 8 bullet points, last slide of Rob Ghiglieri's presentation, and asked for comments.

Bullet 1 – Continued attendance at PDAC & AME. All commissioners agreed to continue.

Bullet 2- Expand the open data site and public education. All commissioners agreed to continue.

Bullet 3 - Continue to fund NBMG special reports., All commissioners agreed to continue.

Bullet 4 - Increase AML hard closures. All commissioners agreed to continue.

Bullet 5 - Postponed until after the financial update in Old Business.

Bullet 6 - Postponed until after the financial update in Old Business.

Bullet 7 - Performance Measures., All commissioners agreed they were adequate.

Bullet 8 - Are there any new initiatives the CMR would like to see addressed by NDOM over the next two years?

Art Henderson: I can't think of anything.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: We can say the Commission really doesn't have any new initiatives to add, but certainly continue to consider it.

Josh Nordquist: Should we circle back on the other items?

Rob Ghiglieri: Do you want to do old business A first?

Mike Visher: Yes.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: We'll move on to old business with the financial update then we'll circle back to the other possible action items that we discussed earlier.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Financial Update

Mike gave a PowerPoint presentation of the fiscal year 2022 forecast revenue and expenditures along with 2021-2025 budgets and forecasts as of 5/10/2022, see attachment.

Art Henderson: Just out of curiosity is your lease going to increase or stay the same?

<u>Mike Visher</u>: It will likely increase but it will probably be on the order of 3% or 4% which is pretty typical.

Josh Nordquist started the discussions of the proposals brought forward by the Division, McCaw, and NMBG for potential approval. Chairman Nordquist first started with the addition of the GIS Analyst position to the FY24-25 budget submission. The Commission and Mike Visher discussed the difference between a GIS III and IV positions, how for budget reason NDOM budgets at the top of the range, and what the current top level for a field specialist position is.

Motion to approve the addition of the GIS Analyst position to the FY24-35 budget submission made by: Bob Felder Seconded by: Mary Korpi
Unanimously approved

Next Chairman Nordquist discussed the Soda Lake Geothermal project proposed by NBMG. The Commission discussed that the project would be very beneficial and was almost approved before. A short discussion was held about the lead of the project, a PhD student and her commitment to the project and a slight increase in the cost of the project since it was initially introduced at a past meeting.

Page **11** of **13**

Art Henderson: Josh, is this a study that would be beneficial?"

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Yes, capturing historical perspective with these resources that has not been done at this level today, absolutely. I recognize that blind systems are what most new geothermal systems are going to be going toward and it will be important for new developers.

Motion to approve the Soda Lake Geothermal Field report with NBMG made by: Art Henderson

<u>Seconded by:</u> Nigel Bain Unanimously approved

Next Chairman Nordquist discussed the Mining District Files and digitizing for universal access proposed by NBMG.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: How much do we them for them now? I forgot, for the cuttings and different things, it's only like \$20,000, right?

Mike Visher: Yes.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: So, they're never going to catch up unless they get an opportunity like this, it doesn't come along very often because the State's not going to give them money, UNR's not going to give them money so they'll always be behind if we don't help.

Rob Ghiglieri: This database is constantly used by the AML program. Anytime a public member or partner asks NDOM if we have any information on a particular mine, this is a first place I go to pull up information.

Motion to approve the NBMG Mining District Files Digitizing Project in the amount of \$35,400 made by: Nigel Bain Seconded by: Mary Korpi

Unanimously approved

Next Chairman Nordquist discussed the Earth Science Field Trip Publications project proposed by NBMG.

The Commission discussed the project's public education and outreach aspect and how it is a benefit, but they were hesitant to support the project due to the fact they could not visualize what the actual product would be by the proposal. Art Henderson also discussed when the Commission first started funding NBMG special projects, that the idea was based on studies and reports, not field trip guides.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: For me, it doesn't fit the parameters that I think of as a special project. I think it's valid and fits with the education program, but to me it's just not the idea of a special project.

Stephanie Hallinan: If we don't fund this, will the field trips continue?

Mike Visher: Yes, the Bureau will continue to have the field trips.

There was no motion on this project and the Commission requested Mike Visher to ask NBMG to provide more details on this proposed project at the next meeting.

Next Chairman Nordquist discussed the McCaw School of Mines proposal. The Commission discussed various aspects of the project including 3D vs. 4K differences, staffing at the McCaw school, how the McCaw Board functions, previous funding towards McCaw, contracting techniques, and that they supported the project but were hesitant to fund the entire project. The Commission felt that they could fund up to the \$15k for the hardware and would be willing to put additional funding towards the project but only if McCaw was able to secure funding from other partners or industry.

Motion to approve up to \$15K for hardware and services and is contingent on securing the remainder of the funds by

<u>December 2022 made by:</u> Bob Felder Seconded by: Stephanie Hallinan

Unanimously approved

Page **12** of **13**

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: Next is the discussion of the hard closure fund. **Art Henderson**: Mike or Rob, what's the downside to this?

Mike Visher: I really don't see a downside.

Rob Ghiglieri: They're going to be providing their proposals, if it is successful, we're going to be getting additional sites closed on the ground that we don't have the time or resources to get to. We have the funding to do it.

<u>Josh Nordquist</u>: I think for me the bottom-line strategy is that it's providing motivation and funding to have others help out with abandoned mines and doing it in the easiest way that you guys can come up with.

Art Henderson: And you're requesting \$200,000 minimum?

Mike Visher: Yes.

Art Henderson: Do you think you can use more than \$200,000?

Mike Visher: Yes.

Art Henderson: Well then, we have enough if you think it's beneficial to spend more than \$200,000.

Josh Nordquist: We're approving the potential spending.

Art Henderson: Yes, that's right.

Josh Nordquist: The question is, let's say whatever amount we approve right now that would start soon and 3 months

from now it's going well, is there anything that prevents us from getting more at that point in time?

Mike Visher: No.

Bob Felder: Who's decision is it to decide which sites?

Rob Ghiglieri: We'll reach out to these entities and provide them a list of sites and see if they're interested in pursuing a closure project and have them submit the project proposal to us.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: I think we should approve enough money to operate the program, it's your judgement to spend it all or not.

Josh Nordquist: We have to put a number on it.

<u>Art Henderson</u>: I say \$400,000. If we spend \$300,000 and other projects come up that make it economical since you're already in the area you should do it.

Mike Visher: \$400,000 will attract attention, people will be willing to put in some effort.

Art Henderson: I've been here 10 years and that's been our goals to close these abandoned mines and save lives.

Motion to approve up to \$400,000 to create the Hard Closure Fund from our current reserve and the progress will be reported at subsequent Commission meetings made by: Mary Korpi

Seconded by: Bob Felder **Unanimously approved**

B. <u>Update on Status of Previously Approved AML Enhancement/Special Projects</u>

Rob gave an update on the status of previously approved AML enhancements and special projects, see attachment.

Art Henderson: Can we get photos of the billboards somehow?

Rob Ghiglieri: Yes, we haven't approved them yet.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

A. Review of staff monthly activity reports

Mike explained the reports are in more detail than the executive summary provided monthly to the Commission so if there are any questions, this is the time to ask about those. There were no questions asked by the Commission.

Page 13 of 13

B. Set date for next Commission meeting

The next meeting will be Wednesday, August 10, 2022, at 1:00 p.m. location TBD.

COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Nigel Bain mentioned that the Mountain Pass mine near Las Vegas is working on an agreement with General Motors to provide rare earth elements for manufacture of magnets at a plant in Texas. Nevada is missing a great opportunity for such a plant to be here instead.

ADJOURNMENT

4:59 p.m.

