The AML Program: Where-to from here?

The AML Program: Where-to from here?
(how, why, and the bumps ahead)
NAAMLP established a SMCRA Reauthorization Committee (SRC)

- Charter signed by Association President, Bruce Stover on February 28, 2014
- Co-chairs:
  - Murray Balk, Kansas
  - Brian Bradley, Pennsylvania

Committee Members

- Alan Edwards, Wyoming
- Bill Dodd, North Dakota
- Glenda Marsh, California
- Greg Conrad, IMCC
- Justin Ireys and/or Samantha Hudson, Alaska
- Madeline Roanhorse, Navajo
- Mike Garner, Maryland
- Mike Mueller, Missouri
- Susan Kozak, Iowa
- Travis Parsons, West Virginia
Mission

• To provide an interactive forum for NAAMLP membership to explore the present political and governmental landscape and develop a strategy for addressing reauthorization of SMCRA.

• To foster and maintain positive and productive relationships between member states and tribes on common reauthorization questions, problems, issues and priorities, in order to investigate, develop and formulate a unified NAAMLP position/platform on SMCRA Reauthorization, for consideration by the Membership.

Objective

• To develop, formulate and draft a unified NAAMLP "Position" or "Platform of Recommendations for SMCRA Reauthorization", for consideration by the Association's full General Membership.
Why is Reauthorization needed?

• Several things have not gone as originally envisioned with the 2006 amendments:
  − AML Inventory
  − Funding
  − Sequestration

AML Inventory (eAMLIS)

Disclaimer: The data is derived from eAMLIS using standard reports for Priority 1 and Priority 2 problems. Anyone familiar with the system would achieve the same results.
AML Inventory (eAMLIS)

- The 2006 amendments originally envisioned that the high hazard inventory would decline and be eliminated in many States and Tribes.
- An indication that the true universe of AML problems has yet to be documented, and that pre-1977 mining continues to manifest new hazards, the inventory of Priority 1 and 2 problems has increased since 2006.

**Priority 1 & 2 Unfunded Inventory 2006 and 2014**

- Priorities 1 & 2 Unfunded (in $ billions)
  - 2006: 6.938
  - 2014: 7.609
AML Funding

- The 2006 amendments originally envisioned that funding would increase allowing programs to expand and undertake more projects sooner; and, consider high cost and complicated projects.

- Due to economic pressures on the industry that could not be predicted in 2006, coal production has declined overall and shifted toward underground mining resulting in reduced fee collection.
AML Funding

- Updated projections have continued to decline demonstrating that the total funding envisioned through the 2006 amendments will not be achieved.
Sequestration

• Unless it is resolved by Congress, or the AML fund is determined to be exempt, sequestration cuts will take an additional bite from the already declining fee collections.
Why work for Reauthorization?

- Significant AML hazards still remain and the AML inventory of Priority 1 and 2 problems has grown.
- Funding has been less than envisioned in 2006 and future projections continue to decline.
- Sequestration is taking an additional bite of the funds available.

Final thoughts

- What would State/Tribe programs look like without AML Grants?
- How would States/Tribes continue to address AML inventory problems? Could they continue?
- Would States/Tribes be able to address emergency AML problems? If not, who would?
- What would OSM look like without Title IV funding?
Your perspective and input is important. Please join us in the Executive Room for the Reauthorization panel discussion, 10:30 - noon.