

Meeting Minutes

Project No.: 09-0040.003
 Project: **Madrid Community**
 Date: July 28, 2010 – Meeting #2
 Place: Madrid Fire House

Attending: See attached sign-in sheet
 By: Ken Romig

Copies To: Parties Present
 Issue Date: August 11, 2010

Discussion Items:

1. Meeting #1 materials can be viewed at www.madridmininglandscape.org. The planning team will upload meeting #2 material to the website ASAP
2. What is the timing of the plan and improvements?
 - a. The plan will be complete by the end of year
 - b. AML is currently having Wilson & Co. (an engineering firm) survey Madrid for engineering purposes
 - i. Surveying/Mapping done by September
 - c. One or two years before design work/construction begin
3. “Slope Zone” – How are the landowners notified of project? AML works with landowners is requested to assist on private properties..
4. Where is intersection of this plan and review process and County review Process?
 - a. AML or consulting engineers will seek everyone approvals of different agencies (Highway, County . . .)
 - b. Some projects may become partnerships for funding purposes.
5. Is there assistance for individual cisterns? Yes, could be part of the plan, however the nature of funding is unknown.
6. Solar opportunities for water pump?
 - a. AML may not directly participate (funding) – could be part of comm. plan
7. Concern about “landscape” focus
 - a. What about walkway? (boardwalk along NM 14)
 - b. Ice House Road?
 - c. Potential health effects of gob on residents?
8. Name is artifact from the original planning focus of the above ground gob piles, the planning process focus has changed
 - a. The planning team is still focusing on the quality of life issue, aesthetic issues are secondary. Four primary improvements are considered at this time:
 - i. Watershed
 - ii. Cart path
 - iii. Meander
 - iv. Ice house
9. Gob piles and health
 - a. Studies from gob pile samples do not show elevated metals
 - b. AML stated that health concerns would supersede individual property needs.
10. AML acknowledged that there are some dust generated from gob piles
11. Are the solutions depicted too urban?
12. Size, location and look of water detention?
 - a. Best treatment would visually disappear
 - b. There is regional sensitivity
 - c. Mosquito concern with open retention: Mosquitoes = 4-day egg/life cycle, water cycle through retention= 2 days
 - d. Open retaining needs some study and strategy
13. Water supply and health?
14. Water quality is considered logically geologically linked to mining activity, however mining impacts on water are not clear.
15. Soils are high ph and are therefore corrosive
16. Gob piles do generate a slightly acidic runoff and may be corrosive
17. Money for projects is generated by tax on coal mining. The projects will be federal projects but not directly funded by federal money.
18. Adit and shaft safety not part of this project, but individuals can talk to AML who will be addressing hazards posed by past mining such as adits or shafts.
19. How will the team handle individual requests for AML work?
 - a. If safety is concern, maybe it is part of plan . . . ?
20. The next community meeting will present the final planning framework.

This report is assumed to be a true and accurate account of this communication unless notice to the contrary is received within 10 calendar days of issue.

End of Minutes