Tuesday, March 31, 2015

BLM GRAVEL SUMMIT - Minerals Materials Management in the Dalton Corridor, March 31, 2015: 8:30am-4:30pm

Action items in RED

PowerPoint Presentation: Rob Ellefson, BLM *Gravel Summit - Intro*

-introductions
-Rob overview of objectives of meeting, corridor, existing Utility Corridor ROD

PowerPoint Presentation: Shelly Jacobson, BLM *The Dalton Highway A Brief History*

Shelly discussed history of Dalton Highway
Described the difference between commonly used terms:

- Utility Corridor as described in public land order (PLO) 5150
- Trans-Alaska Pipeline (TAPs) right-of-way (54 feet),
- Dalton Highway right-of-way 'Corridor',
- five-mile corridor closed to off-highway vehicle (OHV) use by the State,
- Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) no firearm use Corridor.

Mostly talking about BLM planning corridor established by PLO 5150. Talked about history of corridor and road, issues, land ownership, development nodes etc.

PowerPoint Presentation: Tim Hammond, BLM *Gravel Summit - Intro*
Tim did presentation on RMP process purpose and required planning decisions
Discussed possible alternatives under the RMP, in general: Terms and conditions, Areas that could be opened or closed to Mineral Material development

PowerPoint Presentation: Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys (DGGS) - DeAnne Stevens, Trent Hubbard *Dalton Highway, Geology Overview.*

Existing resources and potential
Surface geology (Trent DDGS):

- southern corridor generally south of mile post (MP) 150, soft weathered bedrock covered with loess, limited sand and gravel
- north of ~MP 150 (Prospect Creek) to North of the Brooks Range ~MP 275: glacial and glaciofluvial
    - MP150-175: older glacial deposits, highly weathered, isolated sand and gravel, limited and unexplored until you move into the Koyukuk Drainage.
    - MP175-275 glacial and flaciofluvial
- North of 275 to coastal plain marine and lacustrian sediments and poor quality as construction/engineering resource

Three mapping studies going on now by DDGS
Engineering maps done for TAPs; confidential material, DDGS has access and can distill information from data if needed by BLM.
-Available Data DGGS finds useful includes:

- Guide Book 4 (Brown and Kreig, 1983) has a lot of info about corridor (http://pubs.dggsalaskagov.us/webpubs/dggs/gb/text/gb004.pdf)
- Tom Hamilton (Hamilton, T.D.) has a variety of books on the area. USGS/ADGGS/Contract Geologist
- Kreig and Reger (Geologic Report 66), 1982, DDGS
- all above studies available on DDGS website

-BLM needs the engineering geology data. BLM has taps borehole data. DGGS has borehole data on Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System ANGTS and other data.
-Old data on older gas line projects may be available from Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline (ASAP)
-Trans Canada part of Alaska Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) project, Alaska LNG has Trans-Canada data
-Geophysical data is of interest to BLM also

PowerPoint Presentation: Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (ADOT&PF) - Kevin Maxwell *Dalton Highway Materials from construction standpoint*

3 types of materials are needed for road bed construction, generally from different sources:

1. Bottom 4-6 ft: 'Leveling Fill', mineral soil w/little organic and no ice (dry), needs to be comp-actable, called **Borrow** material (i.e., – any quality meeting the specifications for levelling fill)
2. Middle 3 ft: '**Select**' material, sand and gravel with low silt content. Non-frost susceptible
3. Top 6" (?) **Crush** Material Layer: -crushed material used for gravel surface road or subsurface for paved. Needs to be tough/durable to take loading. Needs to be compactable (that's why crushed) with up to 20% silt, and at least 5-10% greater than 1" size. Can have substantial amount of silt; primary need is tough gravel that is crushed.

Material sources
-It is ideal to have source within project limits; every 10 miles w/in the project length. Partly cost and partly logistics of managing traffic. Time to haul material must be short enough to complete annual construction segments – haul too far and individual phases take multiple years. Project haulage traffic has wear and tear effect on road. Keeping haul w/in project reduces wear and tear on other parts of the road

Borrow: Southern portion of BLM corridor often find borrow material in soft bedrock Yukon R. (MP56) to MP 175. Northern half (MP 175 north) of corridor borrow pits are sited in alluvial material. Alluvial fans in the north may have silt contents of 30% (which is too much) so a singular source to supply borrow may have high silt content. Gravel may be quite soft so typically does not make good crushable source.

Select Materials: For select material look for places with active river action w/in floodplain or alluvial terraces (old floodplains). More durable materials, with less silt are needed e.g., Deitrich River. Also need a gravel bar large enough to accommodate a pit. May also be able to get crushable source if the gravel is hard/durable enough and in high enough proportions.

> Floodplain sources tend to be self-reclaiming. Want work on bar isolated from active channel. Might dig down to water level, keep source isolated in island until work is done. Another benefit is if hole is deep enough to stay thawed during winter, may create overwintering habitat for fish. Once work is done, open channel upstream and

downstream of pit and allow river to start reclaiming. Best management practice (BMP) is to locate material site at downstream point of island and work upstream.

Negatives in working in active channel: River can breach pit and move its channel. One example is a high value sand stockpile at MP 222.7 with 60,000 yards or more, stranded w/in the Dietrich River channel for at least 20 years. DOT has an upcoming project that might be able to use this material soon if river conditions and permitting allows.

Crushable material out of alluvial site: Easier to get from upland sites, but not a prevalent as active channel sources. Some projects might have no alluvial terraces w/in project boundaries.

Present Maps:

Potential Road Projects in Utility Corridor
Remember that these are anticipated projects, and not necessarily already funded/authorized through the State process

- MP 55-90 Reconstruction (Yukon River to Finger Mt.): **2020** and beyond for starting date
- Dalton HWY MP 109-144 Rehabilitation [Old Man Camp to Jim river]: **2019** possible starting date
- Dalton HWY MP 209-235 Reconstruction [Dietrich Camp to Chandalar]: Start date likely **2017**
- Dalton HWY MP 235-247 Reconstruction (Chandalar - Atigun): **2020** and beyond for starting date
- Dalton HWY MP 274-289 Rehabilitation [Toolik]: **2015**
- Dalton HWY MP 289-305 Rehabilitation: **2017**
- New Yukon River Bridge Reconnaissance Study: **2015**
- Roche Moutonnée Bridge Replacement (MP265): **2016**

General sources of material w/in corridor; these were displayed on maps.
3 geologic units

- green color on map: alluvial fans, good borrow, prevalent in north part of corridor, but virtually absent in the south. But south has soft bedrock sources. Can find borrow almost anywhere in the corridor.
- magenta color on map: active channel. many active channels, but need a large enough island and a way to get a road to it. Also, permitting is more complicated if the river is navigable.
    - red dots on map: hard bedrock - - Some of these may also work as riprap sites. High quality resources for durable riprap are generally limited in corridor.

Questions
Hard bedrock sources are those referred to as quarries? Yes. Usually requires blasting.

- Southern sites w/in 30 to 40 miles of Yukon River crossing, can these be used for riprap? Not sure, but it would be a good place to sample for it. Sometimes bring riprap up from Fairbanks when bringing equipment up from Fairbanks
- Riprap is unique product and when needed is essential, also use smaller amounts, so more practical to haul than sand or gravel
- What kind of permitting is BLM doing for sites determined navigable? Access road only

- Timeline for recharging floodplain material sites? Won't refill pit with material that could be mined later on w/in lifetime, but can restore the river to its normal configuration in shorter timeframe.
- How are road sections planned and funded, keeping in mind haul length and known sources? How are they planned and then how are they funded? Magnitude of job, how much new material, how will it be mined, will be used to develop estimate for job to get funding from legislature. But contractor might come in with lower or high bids. Will contractor be directed by DOT to plan work to fit with the estimate from legislature? WILL COVER LATER UNDER USER DISCUSSION
- Is material cost is small part of total cost? What is the royalty cost? BLM free, DNR 50 cents per yard. Major cost is hauling. Royalty cost as part of overall project is typically very small, but depends on where the material comes from.

Return to PowerPoint Presentation: DGGS - DeAnne Stevens, Trent Hubbard *Dalton Highway, Bedrock geology and potential for material sources within 1 mile of Dalton Highway*

DeAnne - Bedrock Geology
DISCLAIMER: Data presented is not a final product and is really meant as an informal discussion. Data quality is affected by poor scale of geologic mapping (regional vs. local), map edge 'border faults', and lack of detailed information.

Generally:
- bedrock sources south of Brooks Range metamorphosed (fractured, baked), north of Brooks Range less processed and softer.
- detailed geological maps available for portions of corridors in PowerPoint
- Generalized bedrock categories: presented in decreasing quality of material for road purposes (colors refer to map display)
  - Igneous - red - riprap
  - Carbonate - blue -riprap
  - Quartz rich - gold
  - Mixed beds - yellow - potentially useful
  - Generally unsuitable or unknown - purple

Potential sources of **riprap**
Livengood to Bettles quad 2 sites existing.
Bettles Quad - one crushed stone riprap site; lots of other potential sites
Upper Bettles Quad - less potential
Wiseman Quad - 2 quarries in this quad, but limited
Chandalar Quad - some potential, but more limited
Galbraith Lake - fewer and fewer bedrock sources as you head north.

Approximate mile marker where bedrock sources drop out dramatically MP275, near Galbraith Lake. MP 355 is approximate location of the last mappable unit of bedrock w/in 1 mile of highway.

More detailed info needed includes material related parameters e.g., info on weathering, joints, engineering information. Landform analysis needed.

Questions

Does DGGS communicate with Samantha Carroll (Large Project Coordinator with ADNR)? Yes go through Samantha and she will distribute to DGGS.

Is MP 261 potentially best source of Riprap bedrock? At times this material is exported all the way to Prudhoe Bay due to its durability? Yes. BLM wants to make this material available/noted high interest in this material.

At what point do you chose to change material specifications vs. hauling from a long distance? The answer is complicated. Rock must have the quality needed. Try to design projects to take advantage of what is locally available, but don't always know what is available w/out testing.

How much processing of materials is acceptable to ask for from the contractor? If you do enough processing, can we get all 3 materials out of one source? Does not make sense to process a high value material resource to make common borrow. Agencies prefer to use the source for its best value. Processing can create other issues like water quality or the amount of water needed for processing.

BLM would like to know what is the tradeoff between more processing vs approving more material sites. BLM would like to get past the first reaction that all that matters is cost and be able to discuss other options.

Cost is of concern, because if one project is very expensive, it may preclude other projects. There is limited funding from the legislature.

DOT sets parameters for bidding. How does DOT set these parameters? What level of exploration is done before going out for bids? Typically DOT will do some drilling before and want high level of confidence that material exists. But contractor can choose not to use the suggested sites.

If contractor chooses to use other sites, then they need permit from BLM for these other sites. This is a concern and a workload for BLM.

Does DOT puts together contract packages with assumptions that materials are available on BLM-managed lands? Yes. Ideally DOT will have permitting for these material sites well in process before going out for bids on a project.

PowerPoint Presentation: Rob Ellefson *BLM Gravel Summit - Current Use and Management, Modified (presentation was modified following meeting for numerical clarity, notes below are from presented slides)*

Within the Utility Corridor there are:

- 52 current material sites (existing, approved but not used yet)
  - 25 sand and gravel
  - 20 rock pits
    - 5 riprap
    - 15 common rock
- 7 exploration sites - application for new material site, tentatively platted, may being drilled

- 74 BLM permits are currently being managed. - Spreadsheets on walls

- 49 ADOT Free Use Permits (FUP)
- 23 Alyeska Pipeline Services Co. (APSC)
- 4 exploration permits
- 2 contract sales (cost recovery)

Currently there are two major users - ADOT and APSC

Sites can have more than one authorization. There are currently 20 dual use sites. These have their own issues such control and ownership of produced materials (possibility of theft/trespass), responsibility for trash and other items onsite, contractors working for both APSC/DOT at different times in same pit.

Amount of Material used:

ADOT - approximatly 1.5 million cubic yards (over 8 yrs)
APSC - 380,000 cubic yards (10 yrs)
Other - 22,000 cubic yards (8 yrs)

Question: Do these numbers include materials from State owned material sites? There are a couple of state sites, Marion Creek, Coldfoot, etc. that are not included. State DOT has 30-31 BLM sites along the corridor. Not all are being used. Some are very small.

Discussion of APSC access roads, maintenance of access, and erosion control.

Fill material for old camp pads, could be resold. Can things that are decommissioned be recycled rather than just reclaimed? Can APSC resell materials for repurposing rather than reclaiming?

- 2.5 million cubic yards mined from BLM since 2004
- 2-4 material sites active each year
- Site authorized on average every five miles on Dalton. This is on par with Elliott and Richardson highways.
- Of 45 authorized sites, at least 18 have seen no production during the 10 year permit period. Some sites have not been used for decades. BLM would like to discuss this more and give consideration to closing some of these sites

Future use in Corridor

Comment: Need to go back and look at numbers during pipeline and road construction to get a better idea of what is needed for future projects like ASAP and AK LNG. Generally, commenter feels that these projects (as well as TAPS initially) underestimated amount of gravel needed and impacts of the gravel extraction.

APSC use of materials is pretty level now. Do not anticipate large surges in needs, unless there is a large flood event.

Was there an analysis of gravel use for TAPS 30 year ROW renewal? This would be a good source of data to check on.

ADOT Comments on their future use/needs.

-Ryan Anderson: Most upcoming projects are federal aid highway projects. The Road realignment project to deal with debris flow will occur from 2017-2021 for the whole project.

What is the legislative list of projects? State transportation improvement program (STIP) available online. STIP (2016-2019) showing 11 projects on Dalton. DOT has a 10 year plan with 19 projects on Dalton. The DOT plan is internal, but not proprietary. Have map with projects to hand out.

2015 will be a record construction year. Most projects are federal funds with state matching funds. There is $1 billion in Federal and State matching funds for 2015 road construction Statewide. Mostly construction funds with little State-matching maintenance funding

Question: If bridgework, cost is high, but mineral materials is minimal. Is there a way to pull this cost out?

Good cost estimate is not available until final design. Have general estimates for National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. Three years before project starts, enough data to decide if there is a need to ask for additional pits. Three year lead time is required for identifying additional material needs.

What is a major realignment of the Dalton Highway? Refer to it as modernizing, adjusting grade and curves to meet safety guidelines. These are not considered major realignments, they are considered minor realignments. Also DOT is focusing on reducing operation costs in the future and keeping traffic moving, such as raising grade of road near Deadhorse to prevent problems due to drifting snow and sagging. This will take a lot of material, highway centerline might move 10 feet for many, many miles.

Dalton 274-289 is currently only construction work on BLM-managed portion of the corridor.

MP 265 bridge replacement

MP 209-235 in the design phase, with actual project some years away from construction.

What are anticipated needs for repaving and maintenance? Will there be increased need for materials to maintain paved road vs. gravel?. Asphalt can be reycled. Asphalt has higher quality requirements, so availability of material sources is more important for paved vs gravel. Generally will use more aggregate to maintain gravel road vs. apaved road. Lose an inch per year on gravel roads. When roads are paved, DOT improves the road bed to reduce future maintenance.

Does DOT track amount of material used in construction vs. maintenance? DOT maintenance does track usage of the materials for accounting purposes. Need to talk to Maintainance and Operations (M&O). Not sure if they can use those numbers to project future needs. There are orders of magnitude more materials needed for construction vs maintenance.

DOT is large organization divided into many divisions, hard to know who at DOT to talk to.

DOT roughly estimates that 4-6 additional new material sites might be needed to support currently known projects over next decade.

Dillon(?) or Kevin discussion of future projects. Can share notes with Rob.

BLM used to have quarterly meetings with Office of Pipeline Management, then less frequently, but more participants from other agencies/users. Suggest these meetings be held again in the spring, to help avoid surprises and allow for discussion between all stakeholders.

DOT said it is useful to hear from the perspective of BLM what are we trying to do? This would help others know what info is needed?

BLM planning questions and management issues:

- Is there even enough mineral material in the corridor to meet future needs?
- How to balance gravel use with other uses, allow people to plan ahead rather than to react
- ID sensitive areas where BLM does not want pits, e.g., Sukakpak Mt area
- Need plan consistency for permitting
- BLM is hoping to do some zoning where it would not allow pits. Where should these areas be located?
- How to contrast pros/cons of having lengthy sections w/out pits
- Understanding what is normal or prudent by industry vs. what is discretionary.
- Focus on good projects vs profitability for individual contractors, especially for public works.
- BLM wants to participate in the STIP more.
- Standard stipulations are needed for material sites
- Information is needed for cumulative impact analysis and reasonable foreseeable future actions
- BLM needs to support existing authorizations like road and TAPs, so need to know how much materials is needed in the foreseeable future for maintenance
- BLM can consider right-of-way avoidance areas, which make a higher bar for permit approval, but does not totally preclude rights-of-way.
- BLM can live with estimates for 10 year period vs. annual
- Does DOT and APSC coordinate their needs so they are not each getting pits when one could be shared?
- BLM can use GIS analysis to inform past, present, and future uses
- Did the older projects gas pipeline that never came about do a RFD for gravel and is this data available? Never issued authorizations for material sites, applicants were never able to come in with a need. These have been vacated? They would need to do supplemental EIS for materials extraction.
- ASAP is doing a supplemental environmental impact statement that includes material sites locations and quantities.
- BLM and the State need to work together to determine navigability on rivers crossing the highway corridor, to clarify ownership of instream resources that may be available for mining.
- BLM would like to consider projects with secondary purpose, such as creating a float pond at Wiseman airport while getting materials.

ADOT major issue: the time it takes to authorize a BLM pit for State use, both the initial authorization (general) and the specific operator's authorization, seems onerous.

Pete Nagle Alyeska Pipeline Services (APSC) Lands Manager

- APSC did historic analysis going back to 2000 and came up with 30,000 cy as average use of materials over that 13 year period. Atigun and Galbraith (old site) were largest contributors.
- This estimate of 30,000 to 50,000 cy annually is for maintenance and emergency use.
- Biggest issue is maintaining diversity of access to pits; don't forecast asking for new sites.
- APSC has one pit about every 12 miles on average.
- On state lands, the sites are pre-designated, so no need to ask for new materials, only sign contract. No need to be advertised anymore. Each operator has a separate Mining and Reclamation Plan (MRP) for each site developed.
- Maybe BLM can designate sites in the RMP similar to what DNR does? Rob can discuss later. Typically BLM has done negotiated sale, but there are other options

Questions
Does APSC see changing conditions influencing future needs? Will get back to BLM on this later.

For Pre designated state pits is there a standing reclamation plan or does APSC do a plan? Any site with active contract as of 2001 had a broad brush designation of pits available to sell out of. If DNR creates a new site, it needs to be redesignated. Each contract has its own mining and reclamation plans.

What is the state doing to address the issue of noxious and invasive plants in their pits? Dept. of Agriculture has a weed-free certification program to certify pits as weed-free. DNR is starting to include invasive species monitoring in contracts.

BLM has been documenting spread of noxious and invasive plants to the north. It is trying to figure out how to get a handle on this problem both in RMP and on permits.

Issue – If there are invasive species in a pit could take several years to clean up an infested pit. If APSC is not allowed to use the pit until cleaned up, this would be huge impact on TAPs. APSC needs continued access to their existing pits.

BLM's weed strategy is to treat pits where it is still possible to eradicate or control invasive species. There are 11 such sites. BLM may try herbicide application on one pit which is far from water this year. This would be the first time BLM has applied for a pesticide application permit.

BLM would like ideas from everyone on how to control invasive species and best management practices.

Economist Magazine – An article titled Not Weeds published March 28, 2015 print edition about the British view of invasive plant species in Britain. Article Discusses: "do interloping plant species from other lands actually cause environmental damage by outcompeting the locals?"

Does APSC currently have best management practices (BMPs) in place for dealing with invasive species? There is some mention of it in Alyeska field identification guide to help BLM with inventory. Not sure if there are BMPs.

State of Alaska does have a list of prohibited noxious species by law developed by the. Dept. of Agriculture. It also has a list of species that are problematic, but not prohibited. Plant materials center has more information on these issues.

If APSC goes to a site to get materials and find it covered with bird vetch, what is the procedure to be followed? Not sure if they have guidelines in place or not.

BMPs are already available from lower 48 states.

The permitting process is so onerous that APSC has not been able to spray. APSC has hit a brick wall. They would like to consider herbicide use.

In Fairbanks, several agencies (Corp of Engineers, Alaska Railroad) use herbicides, but APSC has not been able to.

BLMs concern is how to communicate with subsistence users on use of herbicide. It is an emotional issue and the technical information hard to understand. BLM proposed limited use of herbicides on the Dalton Highway in the environmental assessment because it is controversial, but also wanted to analyze the potential impacts.BLM stipulations include cutting and mowing before seeding, weed pulls on strategic river crossings, washing equipment.

- One possible best management practice from lower 48is vehicle washing stations. So far BLM has said these are not manageable, but maybe it needs to be considered.

- All APSC sites are dual use with DOT except for 3.
- Does DOT have BMPs? Yes, vehicles are washed before coming on site; It has a BMP guide put together with cooperative extension for right-of-way maintenance. This is designed for use by other agencies. Process has been delayed somewhat.
- DOT has integrated plan for invasive species.
- Dept. of Environmental Conservation (DEC) recently changed regulations to allow for herbicide use.
- There is high public concern about herbicide use. Level of concern varies by region.
- Weed free gravel certification is more difficult because the material is owned by State and federal government. Cannot require use of certified materials immediately because would shut down pits and make material unavailable.
- Discussion of State web site listing Prohibited & Restricted Noxious Weeds http://dnr.alaska.gov/ag/akpmc/invasives/pdf/noxious-weeds.pdf; or
- http://plants.alaska.gov/invasives/noxious-weeds.htm

APSC major issues: Invasive species requirements affecting APSC's continued access to those existing sites in use

Cindie Little, Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline (ASAP)

- Still in pre engineering phase, but estimate a need of about 13.5 million cy north of Yukon River for initial construction of ASAP. This is based on 36 inch pipeline. If a decision is made for a larger pipeline, more material would be needed.
- Long-term maintenance needs would be similar to APCS (30-50,000 cy/yr)
- One difference from TAPS is that the gas line will be buried and is cold, not warm
- Nolan Heath suggested the gas line would probably need less than TAPs, as there are fewer access roads for ASAP
- Need access roads to get to the gas line for maintenance. Might find maintenance needs higher.
- Bedding and padding material for the pipe has to be fine sand (12" total, 6" above and below. 4.5' wide trench). Envision a 5' by 5' trench. Will fill in the ditch with the material pulled out. Access roads and pads do not need to last long, so won't need special materials. Will need riprap for certain areas.
- Camp pads and lay down yards. Require 4 inches of better quality material that will compact for surface. Included in 13.5 million cy
- No compressor stations are needed for 36" pipeline.
- There is a definite need for more gravel sources on the Dalton Highway to meet needs of ASAP, DOT, and TAPs.
- Does anyone know how much material is available from existing pits?
- APSC mine plans outline an area where cultural clearance is done and it has some estimate of reserves for this area, but not sure how this estimate was developed. It is not sure how good the estimates are. Usually these estimates are quality based. You cannot take the number at face value, it might estimate 100,000 cy, but only 70,000 cy are usable.
- When do we have enough exploration data? Come up with minimum standard plan for exploration?

- Are DOT and APSC amenable to co-location with ASAP? ASAP has had some discussion on this topic with DOT and APSC, but these sites are in use already and might not have room for another party.
- ASAP will need 4-6 camps and pipe storage yards combined (4 camps/pipe storage, 2 pipe storage only). Of course it is a money savings to reuse camp sites from others, so ASAP would like to do this when possible. The original EIS for ASAP assumed use of all existing camp sites so that is what was analyzed.
- Old construction camp sites could be reused. APSC pump station sites are too small and currently in use so probably would not be useable as co-location site.

- **Karen Ray, Alaska Liquified Natural Gas (AK LNG) –**
- Likely there will only be one of the two pipelines built, not both
- AK LNG has no estimate of gravel quantities yet, but pipe is larger than ASAP so would need compressor stations. It is doing field work this summer. Resource reports draft 1 with FRQ. Final Resource reports draft 2 will be done next summer. It is afe to say that AK LNG will

need more material than ASAP because of the lager pipe size and the need for compressor stations.

Lunch 11:45 ~ 1:15

Powerpoint Presentation: Rob Ellefson, BLM *Gravel Summit – Management and future management options*

Questions or comments on this presentation:
-If request is in excess of 300,000BLM must process as a competitive sale. If only one bidder would it qualify as competitive? Good question. Need to follow up on answer.
-Is the 300,000 cy limit per site? No this is for the entire state.
-Is the State bonded? State is self-insured.
-What is the reclamation planand when is it required? Currently BLM does NEPA twice, once on the site location and secondon development of site. This creates more work load and is a difficult issue BLM wants to solve through RMP.
-One concern with competitive sale to operators is the possibility for price gouging.

Jack Reakoff – Wiseman Community Member, perspective on Materials Sites and use in the Wiseman Area, and the corridor in general

- Been in the area since before the pipeline was built
- Generally, site selections have been good
- Called for public meetings with users
- There seems to be ample number of sites available, expansion of the existing sites is much more preferred than opening up new sites
- Consider visual impacts
- Sites in the Wiseman Road area would seriously disrupt short summer tourist season and overall quality of life for residents
- Called for better exploration data to inform a more detailed site analysis

Powerpoint Presentation: Tim Hammond, BLM *Potential standard stipulations that could affect mineral materials management*

Required RMP Decisions

Mineral Materials: “Identify the following consistent with the goals and objectives for the exploration, development, and disposal of mineral materials in concert with the protection of natural resources within the planning area.
1. Areas open or closed to mineral material disposal.
2. Any terms, conditions, or other special considerations needed to protect resource values while operating under the mineral materials regulations.

The potential stipulations listed below are some ideas that have been suggested for consideration. Issues for consideration:

- Inadequate information when analyzing material site authorizations
- Insufficient information about reclamation when analyzing site authorizations
- Hours of operation within specified distances of campgrounds
- Difficulties managing camps associated with gravel operations

- Material Site Distribution/Density
- Poor Exploration Reliability
- Site Closure
- Storage Sites
- Emergency Use
- Spread of Invasive plants
- Revegetation Success

Closing – a call for everyone possibly affected by BLMs planning decisions under the RMP to remain engaged and involved as we formulate our recommendations