

FILED**APRIL 19 2024****SECRETARY, BOARD OF
OIL, GAS & MINING**

Julie Carter <juliecarter@utah.gov>

**Fwd: Proposed Changes to Utah Administrative Code R-647-4**

Ogprogram DNR <ogprogram@utah.gov>
 To: Julie Carter <juliecarter@utah.gov>

Fri, Apr 19, 2024 at 8:03 AM

Hi Julie,

I received a comment addressed to the board regarding one of the current rule changes. Can you please ensure it is routed to the correct parties?

Thank you,

**Kira Carey**

Assistant Project Manager

M: (385)502-0369**E:** Kcarey@utah.gov

Utah Department of Natural Resources

Division of Oil, Gas & Mining



ogm.utah.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Abani Samal** <arsamal@geoglobal.co>

Date: Thu, Apr 18, 2024 at 12:46 PM

Subject: Re: Proposed Changes to Utah Administrative Code R-647-4

To: ogprogram@utah.gov <ogprogram@utah.gov>

Cc: Mick McCaslin <Mick.McCaslin@flsmidth.com>, mining@utahmining.org <mining@utahmining.org>, Robert Schafer <schafer_rw@comcast.net>

From:

Abani R Samal
Riverton, Utah.

To:

the Board of DOGM

I am a geologist with nearly 25 years of experience in the mining industry. I am regarded as an expert in mineral exploration and mining operations worldwide. I am writing this email as an individual industry expert residing in Utah.

I read Mr. Schafer's email to you. I agree with his comments.

The proposed changes to the definitions of "**Significant**" and "**Insignificant**" concerning mine planning, mining, and processing operations could have unintended negative consequences impacting the future of the mining industry in our State of Utah. Mr. Schafer has explained this in his email.

I advise you to consult with mine operators and industry experts in the state directly before adopting the proposed changes to Administrative Code R 647-4. Please reach out to industry bodies such as the Utah Mining Association (UMA), the local section of the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America (MMSA), and the Utah Section of the Society of Mining, Metallurgy and Exploration (SME) for detailed responses in this regard. This consulting process may delay the implementation of the proposed changes to Administrative Code R 647-4, which is better than adopting the changes with limited inputs from industry professionals in the state.

Respectfully submitted.

Abani R Samal

Dr. ABANI R. SAMAL

CPG, RM- SME, Fellow- SME, Fellow-SEG

Principal, **GeoGlobal LLC**

Riverton, Utah, USA

e: arsamal@geoglobal.co

t: +1-618-9673679

On Thu, Apr 18, 2024 at 10:08 AM Robert Schafer <schafer_rw@comcast.net> wrote:
To the Board of DOGM:

I am a professional geologist and mineral economist with graduate degrees in both disciplines. I have a +40 year career in mineral exploration, mining and mining-related M&A. I have been the President of a number of professional mining and geological organizations including: the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America (MMSA), the Society for Mining, Metallurgy and Exploration (SME - the largest technical mining association in the world), as well as equivalent organizations in Canada (CIM and PDAC), and the Chair of the US and Canadian Mining Halls of Fame. I have published extensively on geology, the business of exploration and M&A and mining finance. I have lived in Utah for more than 30 years, working both locally as well as internationally. I remain very active in my profession.

I understand the the DOGM Board is considering making important changes to Utah Adminstrative Code R-647-4, which would have significant impact on the future of mining in our State. Of particular concern is the proposed change to the definitions of "**Significant**" and "**Insignificant**" in relation to mine planning and mining and processing operations. The proposed language would have the impact of converting what are modest changes in an operating plan or change in processing equipment as technology improves from a "insignificant change" and not requiring public comment, to a "significant change" that would require public comment and possibly delay improvements unreasonably or even negate them when they are for the better good.

Here are several examples:

- a.) Adopting a new type of process equipment for an operation could be held up awaiting input from the general public; even if that equipment reduces emissions, improves efficiency, increases efficacy, etc.
- b.) a mine may consider replacing a diesel-powered ore haulage fleet with an electric fleet. The requirement for public comment would very likely scrub such a consideration and considerable investment due to delays created by a public comment requirement.
- c.) a mine such as the Kennecott operation (or a smaller mining economic contributor such as a sand/gravel/aggregate operation) needs to update its operating plan due to exhaustion of ore in a particular area of its pit, and needs to access new ore in another part of their operating area.

A poorly worded revision to the defintiions for "Insignificant" and "significant" may well shut down some or all of the mining, milling and smelting operations for a period of time awaiting public input.

I urge you to delay adopting the proposed changes to Adminsitative Code R 647-4 until there has been direct input on these definitions from mine operators, a more complete reply from the Utah Mining Association as well as input from the local chapters of SME and the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America. A bad set of definitions can have significant and unintended consequences.

Thank you for reviewing my comments. Please contact if you should wish to ask questions ar comment on this email. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Schafer
CEO, Eagle Mines Management LLC
Registered Professional Geologist in UT and WY
Past President of SME and MMSA

6325 South 2710 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84121
+1 801 608 8188