The EPA is rushing new rules for hardrock mining. Why?

- They say the EPA wants to ensure the public doesn’t pay for environmental cleanup in existing federal and state programs. We disagree.
- The new rule ignores co-located mining activities, creates new barriers for mining exploration and inhibits mineral development.

Billions of dollars are currently held in financial assurance for hardrock mining.

Federal agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM</th>
<th>USFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.9 billion</td>
<td>$325 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States

All states with mining operations have additional financial assurance requirements.

268% - growth in the cumulative amount of financial assurance held by Nevada, BLM and USFS from 2005-2016.

Hardrock mining is already HEAVILY REGULATED.

- The number of new mines that can be opened without securing financial assurance to ensure cleanup after a mining project: 0
- The number of major environmental and public land laws governing the hardrock mining industry: 12
- Frequency with which each state BLM director must certify that its financial assurance will cover all necessary cleanup activities: EVERY YEAR

MINERALS ARE ESSENTIAL TO U.S. industries, job growth and GDP.

- Mining creates 1.7 million direct and indirect jobs
- $46 billion in bonds to federal, state and local governments
- The industries that rely on U.S. minerals: $2.5 trillion in the U.S. GDP (2015)

The EPA is...

- Acting without the facts. Although required to consult commercial insurance and financial industries prior to proposing any new rule, they failed to collect new information and relied only on publicly available data not related to the rule itself or the future financial assurance obligations.
- Leaving out the experts. The EPA proposed rule assumes that a one-size-fits-all approach can be applied to all hardrock mines, excluding that experts in geology, geography, terrain, climate, mining and state and federal financial assurance obligations know in advance.
- Creating higher costs. The proposed rule eliminates the cost of compliance by tens of millions of dollars.