

An OSM official worries about how to “sell” the proposed rule to the public because it will only save 15 miles of stream, while costing millions in taxpayer dollars and thousands of American jobs.

**Unofficial Transcript Provided by Contractor**  
**(Department of the Interior has not provided even a redacted version of this transcript)**

OSM 2 6:56	(Unintelligible) . . . To me the most important table for me, but not for everyone, is 4-14, on page 4-14 and 4-15. And, I wasn't the only one who brought this comment. And, you're going to see a very long comment from me, but, I still, and just very surprised, and the numbers are what they are. I don't have that much vested interest in the numbers per se. But, I have a hard time understanding, and it needs to be described, of how currently we have 110, 111 miles of streams being impacted, throughout the U.S., O.K., and through 196 pages of proposed rule with a lot of complex stream protections, we're going to take 110 miles and whittle it down to the preferred alternative to 94 miles. So, at the end of the day, this whole effort, and I'm not going to, and again, you guys have expertise, but to me, I want some dialog on that. What's still impacting these streams because either you guys aren't understanding the rule or we're not understanding the on the ground effect of this rule. And to me, it'll never sell to the public, Congress, to anybody, that if we have this have this huge rule, that we're only going to save, say, 15 miles of streams. With my \$60 per stream mile for fishing trips, that's not a lot . . . (unintelligible). I'm not asking you to change the numbers. I don't care about that, I think they need to be described. Because, if I have that questions, everyone's going to have that question. So, where are the streams being impacted? Surface mining? Underground mining? What region?
OSM 1	Yeah, that is a . . . I will tell you part of the bottom line, knee jerk reaction is we are doing, we've already spent \$5 million on the EIS contract and X million dollars on our internal travel and payroll and everything else and 160 pages of rule change. 500 hundred pages of preamble and we're saving 15 miles of stream? Come on -
Contr. 2	It's your government at work.
OSM 1	200 hundred million dollars a year of cost to implement this rule, for 15 miles of stream?
OSM 2 9:14	So, not asking to change the numbers, I just want to be real clear. I just think they need to be very descriptive of what's still causing the impacts, because that will shed light onto your analysis, that these activities are still allowed to occur, allowed to impact, where they're occurring at, what regions and . . .
OSM 1	And what kinds of impacts.
OSM 2	What scenarios (unintelligible) And, I could have talked all day with you guys just to understand this table (unintelligible)
Contr. 3	I think that needs to go back in methodology, 4.7, as to how that was built. (unintelligible)
Contr. 4	Actually, those miles saved are on the Potomac from the Monocacy down to the James River. Real important.
OSM 1	I'm actually, I'm particularly interested between the Monocacy and Great Seneca Creek.
OSM 2 10:26	I almost think there needs, I know there's hardly any time. But, there almost needs to be a working session, or something, to really hammer out, I'm sure you don't want another one of those with OSM. That table, is just the meat of this, that's the meat, it's called the stream protection rule, right? So, people are going to be focused on that. That is going to be a headline story. 15 miles, after all this effort 15 miles. (break for lunch)