Mining and Metallurgical Society of America
P.O. Box 810 • Boulder CO 80306-0810
Phone: 303-444-6032 • Web site: www.mmsa.net
Email: contactMMSA@mmsa.net

2018 AML Conference Questionnaire Responses

GOOD SAMARITAN PROTECTION TO ENHANCE ABANDONED MINE LAND CLEANUP-FINDING A PATH FORWARD – April 26, 2018

Summit Theme: "Shared Legacy, Shared Responsibility, Shared Opportunity"

Questionnaires were handed to conference participants and 18 were collected at the time. Later a request for answering the questions on-line was sent to all participants. Seventeen responses were received. The on-line questions were asked a little differently, but most of the questions were the same.

NOTE: Square bullets indicate the responses were from the on-line survey. Circular bullets are responses from the paper surveys turned in at the end of the conference.

One participant made a verbal comment that this was the best conference on this subject he had attended in 20 years.

Following is a summary of the responses that highlight the main points. Detailed responses as they were written are also included. The comments below the summary are recorded exactly as received.

General statements about the conference structure

- The conference was well structured and stayed on topic.
- All said the conference met or exceeded their expectations.
- One participant told several members of the committee that it was the best conference he had been to in 20 years.
- Comprehensive. Phenomenal. Excellent.
- Precisely the right size and format. Well organized.
- Actually designed to produce something useable, not just listening.
- More opportunity needed for side conversations, longer breaks(?).
- Breakout session was too long/too short and ideas were repetitive between groups.
- More time for Q&A.
- Room too small.

Summary of comments on Improving the conference

- More explanation of acronyms.
- Some said the experts represented all constituencies, but a couple of others said that other groups should be included who oppose Good Samaritan legislation. Aim for compromise between groups. Don't demonize the people who oppose Good Sam.
- More input needed from States, local regulators, tribes, NGOs, contractors.

- Reach out to state agencies, federal agencies, watershed groups to get formal statements of endorsement for Good Sam type legislation.
- Arguments pro/con Good Sam legislation would be interesting.
- Provide background information for those not so well informed about the issues.
- Avoid redundancy of legal issues.
- Hearing from experts on agency, Hill, legislative processes
- Make Powerpoints available. All speakers should provide Powerpoints.
- Summary reports. Send to legislators.

Followup Suggestions

- Update on what is being worked on and progress on pending legislation.
- Contact legislators at the state and federal level to gage support for a comprehensive AML bill. Bring those people to the next conference to continue the process of drafting legislation. Bring environmental groups to the table.
- A science-focused session on selecting candidate sites for Good Sam
- Seek remedies at the national level, including legislation authorizing Good Samaritan cleanups. MMSA should work with state and national associations to try to secure such legislation prior to the end of the year.
- Seek feedback from Congressional delegations where input needs re-enforcement. Put together draft w/ parameters for prototype.
- Give some examples, case histories of successful proposals. what people started with, what happened from there -- how many times did you meet, how much feedback was needed, what were the key items missing from most proposals. Showcase successful strategies. (Do this on the Web site.)
- Continue the workshops to progress the issue. Webinars, conference calls - quarterly. Blog.

Other

- There seemed to be a lack of actual remedial technology knowledge here. If Good Sam is going to be constrained to removal, great. If not, the next level of technology options is complicated and often only mildly effective. There seemed to be the assumption that there are many great options out there and that's just not true.

The Questions and Detailed Responses

Following are comments as received.

Q1 Did this AML conference meet your expectations?

- For a realistic understanding of the challenges to Good Sam, we need to include folks who oppose it. There were several attempts to demonize those who oppose it. Those attitudes will hurt the chance of this topic moving forward.
- Outstanding conference with presentations from experts representing all constituencies interested in remedying the effects of abandoned mines.
- I wasn't sure what to expect. It was my first time at an AML conference.
- I really didn't know what to expect, but the information presented and the subsequent discussions were enlightening.
- Very comprehensive with a valuable outcome for Congressional input.
- Actually exceeded them - great interaction & ideas

- I have not had any experience with the mining groups before. This was very interesting and informative.
- There is always room for improvement.
- I have no baseline.

Q2 Did you stay for the entire day? (New question in On-line survey)

- I had to teach after lunch.
- I left about 4:00 because of a prior engagement.
- Interesting topic and I wanted to stay until the end.
- I left about 3:30, just before the final presentation/discussion, so I stayed for most of the day.
- Left in mid-morning to teach classes and returned in mid-afternoon
- Sickness
- I left after the breakout group talk because the day began to feel extremely long and exhausting

Q3/Q2 How could we have improved the conference to meet your expectations?

- The meeting went well overall.
- Include folks with differing opinions. Also there needs to be a funding source for reclamation. Following the Surface Mining Control Regulation would be a good model. Reach out to state agencies, federal agencies, watershed groups to get formal statements of endorsement for Good Sam type legislation.
- n/a, I enjoyed what I heard
- Nothing I can think of.
- Better meeting room
- No additional comments.
- The only thing that would have helped me would be to have a brief 1 on 1 discussion to follow up.
- Being a newbie, I didn't understand all of the acronyms.
- Larger room. Having a leader present at each table to direct the discussion. Our table didn't have a leader.
- Some people were difficult to hear.
- The conference was well structured and stayed on topic. No complaints.
- While Trout Unlimited was represented at the conference, none of the other environmental groups seemed to be represented, which did not provide an opportunity to make any headway on the issues to see if compromise would be possible.
- It was a little too long, particularly the group discussions in the afternoon.
- This conference was phenomenal. A better representation of the argument against Good Sam beyond legal challenges would be interesting.
- Continues to bring in quality presenters and key players in the Good Sam process
- room size was a little tight, but it worked. RE: lunch - hold sweets until afternoon along with water to drink.

- More conflicting viewpoints represented, tribes represented
- Send more/some background reading/literature to bridge the info gap for those on the lesser-informed end of the spectrum.
- Request slides from all presenters.
- Nothing – formatting done very well. Precisely the right size and format.
- Larger venue with more tables
- More input from states & local regulators
- Input from contractors who do the work
- Different meeting room.

- More opportunity for sidebar conversations.
- Larger space
- Good blend of presentations/panels vs breakout groups.
- The two morning plenary sessions needed a lot more time for Q&A.
- More space or rooms for the breakouts
- Attendance list – who's there, who do they represent.
- This is networking also real contact information
- It was an excellent conference.
- Provide materials to participants prior to the conference so they can have some thought to enrich conversation.
- No suggestions.

Q4/Q3 What could we have deleted or used less time on in the conference?

- Was happy with the content
- Nothing I can think of.
- No comment.
- It seemed to be a very informative and complete conference.
- Balance was good for time I was there.
- The reporting in from the breakout sessions was pretty lengthy. Perhaps the groups could have added only new or different ideas once the core themes became obvious (?).
- The breakout sessions in small groups was too long. 45 minutes would have been sufficient. Also, most attendees seemed to know the historical barriers and challenges to Good Sam, so the morning session was just a repeat of what most attendees already knew.
- It was great. If you could have gotten the lawyers to be even more candid that would have been awesome.
- OK as is.
- nothing, think it all went well w/in allowed times.

- Less breakout time, 20 minutes too long
- Was timed perfectly + had time to learn as well as apply concepts
- It was an effective and productive use of a day!
- Avoid redundancy of legal issues.
- More time up front & Q&A.
- 30 minutes less on breakout
- Nothing
- First breakout session longer than needed.
- All was needed
- The second panel.
- There was a good balance between presentations and the workshop.
- I think more time needed for breakouts in next conference and less presentation time.
- Nothing
- All ok

Q5/Q4 What could we have spent more time on in the conference?

- Pending legislation
- Representation from folks who do not support good sam legislation. I believe there are probably legitimate reasons that people have been working on this for 30 plus years.

- The conference was a good balance between different interests - industry organizations, NGOs, state and federal government. Are we ready to ask Indian tribes, local governments, and (shudder) environmental groups to join the discussion?
- No comment.
- I'm not sure.
- Actual government action
- Same as above.
- Not sure
- Oops, answered above.
- OK as is.
- nothing - too much time it gets wasted.

- It was an effective and productive use of a day!
- More detailed involvement of state agencies.
- Hearing from experts on agency, Hill, legislative processes
- Perfect
- More Q/A/comment time.
- Given the presentations, no more time was needed.
- Could always spend more time in the workshop. Good discussions on the legislation (potential legislation).

Q6/Q5 What followup would you recommend to this conference to keep building on the discussions and potential outcomes?

- Need some update on the status of pending legislation.
- Contact legislators at the state and federal level to gage support for a comprehensive AML bill. Bring those people to the next conference to continue the process of drafting legislation. Bring environmental groups to the table.
- A science-focused session on selecting candidate sites for Good Sam
- I would use this event as the catalyst to seek remedies at the national level, including legislation authorizing Good Samaritan cleanups. MMSA should work with state and national associations to try to secure such legislation prior to the end of the year.
- give some examples, case histories of successful proposals. what people started with, what happened from there -- how many times did you meet, how much feedback was needed, what were the key items missing from most proposals.
- Keep us in the loop of what is being worked on and the status of it.
- printed summary of each groups/tables discussion points.
- Any progress on legislation or other initiatives could be communicated to attendees as well as future conferences on the topic
- Not sure
- There seemed to be a lack of actual remedial technology knowledge here. If Good Sam is going to be constrained to removal, great. If not, the next level of technology options is complicated and often only mildly effective. There seemed to be the assumption that there are many great options out there and that's just not true.
- Seek feedback from Congressional delegations where input needs re-enforcement.
- what does work, what doesn't work & put together draft w/ parameters for prototype.

- Political process explanation. Would be nice to know what political steps are coming next.
- Do a 2nd one for folks that didn't come (but will hear about). Then, try to actually draft language.
- Future sessions that focus on the science and the funding! Our group had many interesting talking points.

- Make powerpoints and conclusions available.
- Create and distribute an interpreted and consolidated summary of the conclusions.
- Report back summarizing the breakout sessions and ongoing developments to group.
- Create an AML Website with Good Sam
- Email
- Followup meeting on science issues.
- It was indicated that local community participation was lacking in the summit. Perhaps efforts to reach out to local communities that would be affected?
- Send an email to attendees with the "shared legacy, shared responsibility, shared opportunity" results (from the breakout session)
- Follow up with similar workshops until we have a Good Samaritan regulation at the Federal level.
- Some regular webinar/conference call, maybe quarterly or similar.
- Make sure some sort of a conference consensus document gets to the politicos.
- I would like a copy of the notes from the meeting.
- Continue through sending materials and set up blog.
- Please send out the notes and presentations.
- One next year – report progress.

Q7/Q6 Would you attend a future conference? If so, what would make the subject more useful to you and/or your organization?

- Yes
- Yes, I like when there's a balance of success stories with those that were not successful so as to better evaluate what are successful strategies for dealing with AML and mine closure.
- Yes, I would attend. See recommendations above.
- I'd like to attend. I also want to see more & continuing USGS participation
- Yes.
- more specifics about subject areas that are successful for awards
- Yes. Other than an update/status check, I'm not sure.
- All of this action requires a champion. I really didn't feel that there was a champion in the room.
- A conference with additional technical content on success cases would be of interest
- Yes
- I'd come if the topic is relevant, otherwise it's a little far for me.
- Definitely. See above.
- Yes
- ?

- Distribute list of participants.
- Do it again to progress the issue.
- Next focus on project selection
- The venue was a bit tight for the number who attended.
- Create an AML/Good Sam email list to keep people updated on legislation/ other efforts
- More time from Jeff Parshley
- Keeping us actively engaged.
- This was a good conference.
- Needed to have broader representation such as the enviro community, watershed groups, tribes, local governments.

Q8 Do you have any other comments about the conference and/or suggestions for future conferences? Are there other topics that should be covered?

- The meeting topics were well matched to the subject matter.
- Nothing I can think of.
- No
- Very well organized. As far as the wildlife conservation ngos, invite more of them (even like Pheasants Forever) because this process and outcome is important for all wildlife, even if it doesn't live in the specific area.
- If there is legislation in place, a "how to" conference on meeting the requirements of the legislation on partnering for water and environmental quality restoration would be useful.
- N/A.
- Successful AML remediation projects.
- this was GREAT - actually designed to produce something useable, not just listening. Well thought out, but too bad not more folks stayed for the interactive part of the day.

Q7(Paper Questionnaire) -The following are other comments from Question 7 in the printed questionnaire. Q7 was asked differently.

- Larger room – plan ahead to book.
- Please keep this email thread/group appraised of legislative progress made! (although it'll be big news!)
- Let us know how we can help.
- The first breakout session was longer than needed.
- Presenters should be made to present with a powerpoint.
- Enjoyed & learned a lot!
- I thought this was very worthwhile. Good mix of presenters.
- There is a need for more discussions about scientific issues impeding AML cleanup.
- There is a need to work scientific evidence for adequate site characterization supporting choice of appropriate remedies and expectations that remedies will be successful.
- Please send out attendance list.
- Good choice to do!
- Good opportunity for success.
- Where does this process go from here?
- How can we get involved?
- Thank you very much for organizing this. I am suffering from information overload at the moment.

Q9 Indicate your affiliation

This is from the on-line survey only. The printed questionnaire did not ask for affiliation.

Industry	25.00%	4
Conservation	0.00%	0
Congress	6.25%	1
Government agency	31.25%	5
Academia	6.25%	1
Legal, legislative	0.00%	0
Reclamation, Remediation company	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)	31.25%	5
TOTAL	16	

Q10 – Stay on mailing list?

15 respondents asked to remain on the list.