A new version of legislation to repeal the General Mining Law, offered by Representative Nick Rahall (D-WV), would cripple not only the hardrock mining industry in the West, but the communities that depend on mining tax revenue and the hundreds of thousands of Americans who count on mining for their livelihoods.

"If you wanted to draft a bill that says there will be no more hardrock mining in the United States, this bill is just the ticket," said John A. Knebel, President of the American Mining Congress, the mining industry's principal trade association.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met June 24 to mark up Rahall's revised legislation to repeal the Mining Law. The substitute is an extensive revision of H.R. 918, which was introduced by Rahall and was the subject of several field and Washington hearings. The substitute is more far-reaching than H.R. 918 and will make it virtually impossible to undertake hardrock mining exploration and development in Alaska and other western states.

Paul S. Glavinovich, President of the Resource Development Council, submitted testimony to a congressional subcommittee last summer in Fairbanks (Continued to page 4)

"There will be no new deposits in the mineral pipeline and the U.S. may look forward to being a hostage to foreign sources for our metals, not unlike the situation that we face today with petroleum products."
- Paul Glavinovich

"Any cost burdens during the pre-production period that do not lead to better definition of the reserve and the required mining methods become a parasite that may kill the project."
- Steve Borell

Geologists gather samples at a remote site in the Brooks Range. New legislation to repeal the Mining Law would severely constrain future exploration efforts of potential mineral deposits.
Arctic Power! to lead ANWR offensive

RDC urges its members to support new, non-profit organization

Message from the Acting Director
by Debbie Reinwand

We've all heard the phrase "slow and steady wins the race," and Alaskans can only hope that is the case with regard to congressional approval of oil and gas exploration and production in the Coastal Plain of ANWR.

Alaska has been unwavering in its support of exploration in the 1002 area of ANWR - a fact supported by polls that show even in the worst of times, at least 60% of Alaskans support such development. And a variety of groups have steadily continued to champion the cause throughout a series of setbacks over the years.

It has been argued that the missing ingredient is a vital, galvanized organization with diverse membership that has a sole purpose of securing congressional passage of legislation allowing development in the Coastal Plain of ANWR.

That organization now exists in the form of Arctic Power - a non-profit group formed earlier this year with a statewide board of directors. Arctic Power recently opened an office in Anchorage and has been steadily fundraising through the efforts of its board members and other supporters.

The first and foremost goal for Arctic Power is to establish a broad membership base in Alaska. If 100,000 Alaskans gave Arctic Power a token amount - $5 or $10 - this group could do amazing things in a short period of time. RDC is asking its members to do just that - dig into their wallets and donate any amount - small or large - to provide seed money to this critical organization.

Alaskans gave Arctic Power! a token amount - $5 or $10 - this year, as well as their time and talents. If 100,000 Alaskans give Arctic Power! a token amount - $5 or $10 - this organization could do amazing things in a short period of time.

Endangered Species Act:
A good idea gone haywire

Reauthorization of Endangered Species Act sliding into 1993

By Nancy Davis

With the Endangered Species Act up for congressional review this year, it's time to take a realistic look at this and other well-meaning preservation policies gone bad.

Protecting the spotted owl in the Pacific Northwest is a noble endeavor, but at what cost to those who share that environment? The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America and the AFL-CIO has released an independent study showing that the loss of direct and indirect jobs from spotted owl protection measures would be dramatically higher than the 20,700 reported by the U.S. Forest Service.

Depending on how much private land will be restricted to protect the owl, 81,000 to nearly 104,000 jobs are estimated to be lost. The much lower Forest Service estimate did not account for job losses associated with other public and private lands and underestimated the declining trends in annual timber harvests.

"In the 18 years since Congress drafted the Act, we've learned it is flawed," said Paul Morehead, chairman of the board of directors. Arctic Power! will highlight the environmental safeguards, laws and regulations in place in Alaska that are absent in other known, oil-producing regions of the world.

The list of names of those signing on as board members and founders is impressive - former Lt. Gov. Stephen McAlpine is chairman of the board, and a former RDC President, Bill Schneider, is first vice-chairman. A small staff is being sought to implement the direction of the board.

It is the intent of RDC's board and staff to fully support and assist with Arctic Power's mission and activities. As an RDC member, you will be hearing more about this group from RDC, and we urge you to join as a founding member. To learn more about Arctic Power! contact Jennifer at 563-ANWR (2697) or send checks to PO Box 240628, Anchorage, AK, 99524-0828.

Alaskans need to rally round this critical issue as we look toward the future and the new Congress that will review this issue in 1993.

The Resource Development Council (RDC) is Alaska's largest, privately funded, nonprofit economic development organization working to develop Alaska's natural resources in an orderly manner and to create a broad-based, diversified economy while protecting and enhancing the environment.

Executive Committee Officers
President, S. G. Stebbins, Jr. Vice President, Kelly M. Campbell

The Resource Review is the official monthly publication of the Resource Development Council. RDC is a 501 (c) (3) non-profit organization registered in the State of Alaska. Material in the publication may be reprinted without permission provided appropriate credit is given.
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A vision of oil development on ANWR’s Coastal Plain
by Marc Esslinger

Editor’s Note: Marc Esslinger, a student at Service High School in Anchorage, received Honorable Mention in RDC’s essay contest in June. The first-place essays in the high school and junior high school categories were published in last month’s Resource Review.

You come over the crest of Alaska’s Brooks Range, expecting to see the ultimate environmentalists nightmare: a sprawling oil field of drilling, towering pumps. As you peer globally across the air above the rolling tundra, the haunting vision fails to materialize. All that lags before the eyes is the reflecting waters of the Arctic Ocean. No tundra scars or noisy machinery. Just the peaceful movement of grazing caribou. Welcome to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, August 2010. It’s not until you walk for your landing, that the small pump stations that help power our nation’s economy become visible.

With a booming multi-billion dollar domestic oil industry, we no longer have a demanding dependency on foreign oil. We are kings living off the royalty of our own land. And as promised, we only used one-tenth of one percent of the entire 19-million acre refuge. In the process we have met, and continue to meet, the challenge for environmental safety.

We have proven to our country and its people that developing the Coastal Plain of ANWR was not only a smart choice, but also the best choice.

Mining reform bills headed for conference committee

(Continued from page 6)

patenting, is not even mentioned in the amendment. Other major issues for him, including land planning, repeal of the existing law, and authorized use of mining claims are similarly not mentioned. Alaska miners believe the amendment is nothing but a way by Bumpers to get a bill passed in the Senate. Once that occurs, the bill would head to conference committee where opponents to the Mining law would attempt to mesh it with Rahall’s bill.

RDC and the Alaska Miners Association believe the Mining law works very well, and can continue to accomplish the basic goal of allowing orderly and market-directed exploration and development of minerals on public lands, consistently with publicly recognized environmental standards.

One fact that is not well understood and is often not well articulated is that the Mining Law is a property rights law. It establishes the rules and requirements that individual must follow in order to establish a property right, maintain that right over time, and if the mineral values are sufficiently great, become the fee simple owner of the property.

The Mining Law is not an environmental, reclamation, clean water or clean air law. The original mining law or spirit of the Mining law state that the environment be protected. Most state have at least a dozen such laws of their own.

Unquestionable and other measures, scores of provisions exist today at both the federal and state levels to protect our water, wildlife, air and land,” said RDC’s Glavinovich.

Most Americans favor balance between environmental and economic concerns

A recent national survey conducted by Times Mirror Magazines (TMM) has revealed that most Americans reject the idea that the environment and economic growth are fundamentally in opposition to one another. Most of the 1,200 adult Americans responding to the survey believe that most of the time a balance can be struck between environmental protection and economic progress.

David B. Reckland, Ph.D., executive director of the TMM Conservation Council, said the survey has shown that most Americans are optimistic that natural resource problems can be solved with policies that permit the multiple use of public resources.

"They will support government programs and candidates for public office that protect the environment through sound management while also using them for the benefit of our economy and the public. Only 26% feel that development and human activity should be prevented to protect and conserve wildlife and natural areas."

The TMM survey also revealed:
• Almost two-thirds of respondents (65%) disagree with the notion that economic development can go hand in hand with the preservation of the environment.
• Most respondents (88%) feel that economic security and well-being have priority over environmental problems. Only 51% agree.

Survey: Americans favor balance between environmental and economic concerns

(Continued from page 3)

national elections have voted in the past for or against candidates on the basis of their positions on environmental issues.
• Health concerns drive the environmental priorities of Americans. The percent of respondents who chose the following ten environmental issues as one of the most serious are: 1) Water pollution 77%; 2) Toxic waste pollution 72%; 3) Water shortages of drinking water 68%; 4) Air pollution 64%; 5) Damage to ozone layer 62%; 6) Landfall shortage 58%; 7) Loss of open areas 46%; 8) Extension of plants, animals and insects 45%; 9) Global warming 45%; 10) Loss of wetlands 42%.

In five specific examples in which respondents had to choose the most important facets of the mining law. Self initiation is the most important facet of the mining law. Self initiation is the most important facet of the mining law. Self initiation is a ploy by Bumpers to get a bill passed in the Senate. Once that occurs, the bill would head to conference committee where opponents to the Mining law would attempt to mesh it with Rahall’s bill.

RDC and the Alaska Miners Association believe the Mining law works very well, and can continue to accomplish the basic goal of allowing orderly and market-directed exploration and development of minerals on public lands, consistently with publicly recognized environmental standards.

One fact that is not well understood and is often not well articulated is that the Mining Law is a property rights law. It establishes the rules and requirements that individual must follow in order to establish a property right, maintain that right over time, and if the mineral values are sufficiently great, become the fee simple owner of the property.

The Mining Law is not an environmental, reclamation, clean water or clean air law. The original mining law or spirit of the Mining law state that the environment be protected. Most state have at least a dozen such laws of their own.

Unquestionable and other measures, scores of provisions exist today at both the federal and state levels to protect our water, wildlife, air and land,” said RDC’s Glavinovich.

Most Americans favor balance between environmental and economic concerns

A recent national survey conducted by Times Mirror Magazines (TMM) has revealed that most Americans reject the idea that the environment and economic growth are fundamentally in opposition to one another. Most of the 1,200 adult Americans responding to the survey believe that most of the time a balance can be struck between environmental protection and economic progress.

David B. Reckland, Ph.D., executive director of the TMM Conservation Council, said the survey has shown that most Americans are optimistic that natural resource problems can be solved with policies that permit the multiple use of public resources.

"They will support government programs and candidates for public office that protect the environment through sound management while also using them for the benefit of our economy and the public. Only 26% feel that development and human activity should be prevented to protect and conserve wildlife and natural areas."

The TMM survey also revealed:
• Almost two-thirds of respondents (65%) disagree with the notion that economic development can go hand in hand with the preservation of the environment.
• Most respondents (88%) feel that economic security and well-being have priority over environmental problems. Only 51% agree.

Survey: Americans favor balance between environmental and economic concerns
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Rahall proposal would radically change U.S. mining

(Continued from page 1)

on the hotly contested H.R. 918. He told Rahall then that H.R. 918 would repeal "a demonstrably working law and replace it with a system rife with such financial and regulatory burden that it would eliminate all but a very few major mineral interests."

Glavinovich warned that Rahall’s new bill amounts to an "assault on the Mining Law. "While the legislation would not immediately affect the output of existing mining operations, it would shut down the pipeline of existing and future exploration projects and force the industry to seek replacement reserves from foreign sources. This would have a demonstrably working law and replace it with a system rift with such payments.

There will be no new deposits in the mineral pipeline and the U.S. may look forward to being a hostage to foreign sources for our metals, not unlike petroleum products," Glavinovich said.

The 1872 Mining Law gives citizens the right to enter public lands, explore for minerals, and upon their discovery, perfect ownership of the mining location. The result is that private citizens and companies are now willing to expend large amounts of time and money to explore for minerals on public lands at no cost to the government.

"This proposal, if enacted, would radically change mining as we know it in the United States," said Knebel of the American Mining Congress. A recent study demonstrated that legislative efforts to repeal the Mining Law would cost as many as 50,000 jobs and as much as $200 million per year in lost federal revenues and increased spending. The study was prepared by the accounting firm of Coopers & Lybrand and the law firm of Davis, Graham & Stubbs.

"Rahall’s latest version could increase these numbers drastically," Knebel said.

The substitute does not reflect any practical understanding of mining, the mining industry or economic realities. They stress that all but the major mining companies will be forced out of business by the high costs for holding claims. The Rahall bill would add significant costs to mineral prospects in the early years of the project life at the very time miners can least afford them. Proposed rental fees, increased recordation fees and new annual holding fees that escalate every five years would nearly eliminate the small miner or prospector.

A common focus of the complaints against the Mining Law has been the allegation that patenting of mineral resources cost the miner only $2.50 per acre. This is an administrative transfer fee which is a minuscule part of the total expenditure required. Before a miner can patent his claim, he must first prove the claim. Such action demands a very specific, time consuming, exacting and expensive procedure. As a result, the cost of patenting is very high.

The proposed incremental increases would be especially hard on miners in Alaska, where it takes 15 to 20 years to bring a mine into production. Time required to develop a mine in Alaska is often two to three times longer than elsewhere because of the very short season, the remote location of the prospects and the lack of infrastructure.

The bill does the very thing that will hurt untold numbers of new projects the most—-it adds costs and uncertainty in the early years of the project life, at a time when the project can least afford them. Many of the most prospects are found not by major corporations, but by individual prospectors or small companies. After locating a prospect of a yet-unknown value, the individual will often work for several years to evaluate the area before a sufficient base of knowledge exists to consider mining or leasing the prospect to a larger company. Adding more cost burdens before a project is in production will decrease the chance that the operation will ever be developed.

"Any cost burdens during the pre-production period that do not lead to better definition of the reserve and the required mining methods become a parasite that may kill the project," said Steve Borell, Executive Director of the Alaska Miners Association.

In addition to the incremental fee increases, Rahall’s bill would add obligations by demanding the successful miner of the opportunity to own the minerals and have a secure tenure or title. Patenting provides the security for the individual and provides security that can be used by financial institutions when making loans.

A common focus of the complaints against the Mining Law has been the allegation that patenting of mineral resources cost the miner only $2.50 per acre.

The fee paid to the government for a patent is $2.50 per acre for placer claims. This is, however, an administrative transfer fee which is a minuscule part of the total expenditures required.

Before a miner can patent the claim, he must first prove the claim. Such action demands a very specific, time consuming, exacting and expensive procedure. As a result, the costs of patenting is very high.

In one case, it cost $2,200,000 to patent 20 claims in Alaska. That converts to $5,500 per acre. Because of land management restrictions, that deposit is still not in production.

In another Alaska venture, the cost to patent 32 lode claims totaling 647 acres was over $11 million, equating to $16,699 per acre. And because of permitting delays and the market commodity price, the project is also not yet in production.

"It is a gross misrepresentation of the facts to say that all the miner has to do is stake the claim and pay $2.50 per acre. Nothing could be further from the truth. "- Steve Borell

Alaska has a rich mining heritage with many of the state’s major communities and roadways founded and built by miners who, under the Mining Law of 1872, spent large amounts of time and money exploring for minerals at no cost to the government.

The new provisions incorporate virtually every concept and idea suggested by mining opponents during extensive hearings and almost none suggested by the mining industry. The substitute also incorporates many damaging concepts not mentioned at the hearings.

Companion legislation to Rahall’s bill has been pending in the Senate. Currently at issue is an amendment to S. 433, sponsored by Senator Dale Bumpers. The single issue Bumpers has attacked the loudest over the years.
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