

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tina Morrison <tinamorrison14@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2026 1:19 PM
To: rrc.comments; Jennifer@deq.nc.gov
Subject: [External] Rejection of the proposed mining rules

You don't often get email from tinamorrison14@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Greetings representatives,

The NC Rules and Review Commission **must reject** the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. These are in conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are against public interest.

I ask you to reject the following proposed Mining Rules:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed new Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated”from proposed rule to allow **“unexcavated”** (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” **Remove “Unexcavated”** from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court

records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as **natural** buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

With much appreciation,

Tina Morrison

Burgos, Alexander N

From: fretlessjim@nc.rr.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2026 12:04 PM
To: rrc.comments; Jennifer@deq.nc.gov
Subject: [External] Public Comments on Mining Rules

You don't often get email from fretlessjim@nc.rr.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

The NC Rules and Review Commission **must reject** the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. These are in conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are against public interest.

Reject the following proposed Mining Rules:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed new Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated” from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” **Remove “Unexcavated”** from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local

requirements. Stream buffers should remain as **natural** buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Chuck Sirc <chucksirc@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2026 12:34 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Oppose proposed Rules

You don't often get email from chucksirc@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am a resident of Cary for 30 years. I bike at Umstead Park weekly and appreciate the natural beauty of it. I am opposed to the proposed rules which would not permit me or others to speak out in opposition to further development of the area either for query or other uses.

Please for a change do the right things as opposed to self serving and selling out to developers, par usual!

Chuck Sirc

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Burgos, Alexander N

From: David C Sips <ncgater@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2026 11:26 AM
To: rrc.comments; Jennifer@deq.nc.gov
Subject: [External] Proposed Mining Rules Changes

You don't often get email from ncgater@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

RE: RRC Meeting July 2026

Dear Sir or Madame,

I believe rules changes and proposals will be discussed during the Thursday meeting. Several of these proposed rules are against public interest, facilitate potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act of 1971 (the law), and/or in direct conflict with the law. These Rules should be rejected.

The NC Rules and Review Commission must reject the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. These are in conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are against public interest.

Reject the following proposed Mining Rules:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. Delete Proposed new Rule.

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. Delete Proposed Rule.

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated” from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” Remove “Unexcavated” from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be

approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as natural buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

A very concerned citizen

David Sips

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mary Collins <veganmaryc@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2026 10:48 AM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Retain Public Notices, hearings, and opportunities for citizens to give input regarding Mining Rules

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from veganmaryc@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

As a citizen of NC for over 36 years I am taking some of my inspiration to write this from other citizens who are well versed in details. Know that these comments reflect my position and concerns. I am appalled that someone acting on the Mining Commission should have such clear conflicts of interest and reasons to make changes to long standing policies and rules.

Proposed changes to the Mining Rules benefit multi-billion dollar corporations engaged in mining and Mr. Sam Bratton has a tremendous conflict of interest, he will personally benefit financially from these changes. Ongoing and active Wake Stone litigation would be impacted by these changes, and that is surely known to Mr. Bratton. Specifically "st15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - added text / added restriction "for a modification that adds land to an existing permit."-- Vulcan Materials and Sam Bratton are in active litigation regarding the "adding of land" to the Umstead RDU Quarry.

Making these rule changes would reduce oversight, or remove environmental protections, and leave the citizens who own these protected conservation lands uninformed and less able to communicate their concerns. These proposed rule changes are not posted on the NC Mining Commission webpage and the meeting minutes from 7 July are not posted. They are acting with impunity.

The NC Rules and Review Commission must reject the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. The proposed rules are in conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are against public interest.

Reject the following proposed Mining Rules:

Remove environmental protection: 15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. Delete Proposed new Rule.

Reduce oversight: 15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. Delete Proposed Rule.
Remove environmental protection: 15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete "unexcavated" from proposed rule to allow "unexcavated" (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a "buffer." There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a "buffer" in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local

government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” Remove “Unexcavated” from this proposed rule.

Reduce oversight: 15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

Remove environmental protection: 15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as natural buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

Reduce oversight: 15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

Reduce oversight: 15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

Reduce oversight: 15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Director should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

Respectfully,

Mary Collins
211 Howland Ave.
Cary, NC 27513

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Larry Gritz <gritzmap@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2026 9:08 AM
To: rrc.comments; Jennifer@deq.nc.gov
Subject: [External] Your conscience

You don't often get email from gritzmap@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

How many time must we ask for your help in preserving what the community has a right to and need! To allow the destruction of safe, secure outdoor spaces to continue only feeds the monster. Please, think multiple times before you vote against the Cary/Triangle population. Do not let this Goliath ruin what they have no right to. Please open your eyes and your hearts!!!! VOTE NO ON ALL OF THE FOLLOWING PROPOSALS:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed new Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated”from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” **Remove “Unexcavated”** from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local

requirements. Stream buffers should remain as **natural** buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

Regards,
Larry Gritz
Local resident

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Geoffrey Kabel <geoffkabel@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2026 6:42 AM
To: rrc.comments; Jennifer@deq.nc.gov
Subject: [External] Objections to Proposed Mining Rules

You don't often get email from geoffkabel@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

The NC Rules and Review Commission **must reject** the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. These are in conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are against public interest.

I request that the following proposed Mining Rules be rejected:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed new Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated” from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” **Remove “Unexcavated”** from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as **natural** buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and

revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

From: Patrick Franz <patricknfranz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2026 8:33 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Everett, Jennifer
Subject: [External] Mining Rules Comments to Rules Review Commission

You don't often get email from patricknfranz@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

The NC Rules and Review Commission **must reject** the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. These are in conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are against public interest.

Reject the following proposed Mining Rules:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed new Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow

the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated” from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging,

roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” **Remove “Unexcavated”** from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as **natural** buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining

permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts

and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are

allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mike Chirico <jmichaelchirico@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2026 6:35 PM
To: rrc.comments; Jennifer@deq.nc.gov
Subject: [External] Mining Rules Comments

You don't often get email from jmichaelchirico@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

The NC Rules and Review Commission **must reject** the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. These are in conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are against public interest.

Reject the following proposed Mining Rules:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed new Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated” from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” **Remove “Unexcavated”** from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as **natural** buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and

revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

--

Michael Chirico, PMP®

704.576.6107

jmichaelchirico@gmail.com

[LinkedIn](#)

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Dan Kelly <Dan.Kelly@sas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2026 5:57 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Everett, Jennifer
Subject: [External] Proposed mining rules from the NC Mining Commission

You don't often get email from dan.kelly@sas.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Good evening! I hope this note finds you well.

I am writing to make clear my objections to proposed mining rules that adversely impact the public interest. I'm not a lawyer, so if my formatting/wording is imperfect, I trust you'll get the gist of my comments.

The NC Rules and Review Commission **must reject** the following proposed Mining Rules per your obligation under G.S. 150B-21.9. These conflict with the Mining Act of 1971, attempt to create law beyond what is specified in the Mining Act of 1971, and are flatly against the public interest.

Reject the following proposed Mining Rules and phrases as noted:

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed new Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. **Delete Proposed Rule.**

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated” from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” **Remove “Unexcavated”** from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as **natural** buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed. You can’t unring a bell; impacting the area and trying to minimize the damage (or retroactively ameliorate the damage) is a vastly different thing than just leaving the natural environment unmolested.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act. Really, any attempt to defang the oversight should be rejected.

Thanks,
Dan Kelly

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Laurie Edgerton <4estrunr@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2026 5:20 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Jennifer@deq.nc.gov
Subject: [External] Comment on proposed rules as submitted by the Mining Commission

You don't often get email from 4estrunr@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hi,

I live in west Raleigh and I run in Umstead park regularly. It is painful to see this lovely public park sacrificed for private profit. Please consider rejecting the proposed rules as submitted by the Mining Commission. I think that several of the proposed rules are contrary to the law (Mining Act of 1971) and public interest.

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(2) – Definitions - Delete New Proposed Rule to exempt logging from mining. This rule should be rejected due to conflict with G.S.74-49 (Mining Act of 1971). Logging to prepare a mining site for extraction has been considered a mining operation by DEQ and is not exempted by the Mining Act. Delete Proposed new Rule.

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(4) – Authorities - Delete New Proposed Rule to allow the Director of Mining to Delegate authority. The Mining Act ONLY allows the DEQ Secretary to delegate (usually to the Director). This new rule could create potential abuses not allowed by the Mining Act. Delete Proposed Rule.

15A NCAC 05A .0202 (c)(7)(C) – Buffer Definition - Delete “unexcavated” from proposed rule to allow “unexcavated” (e.g., land to be destroyed by logging, roads, processing plants, crushers, trucking, and more) to be included as a “buffer.” There is no allowance for such land destruction to be classified as a “buffer” in the Mining Act and goes against the Mining Act (G.S. 74-50 (b) (3)). No other local government or state government would consider a destroyed land surface a “buffer.” Remove “Unexcavated” from this proposed rule.

15A NCAC 05B .0104(d)(1) and (d)(3) – Required Permit Information - Delete allowing the Department to determine land ownership. Land ownership should be determined by the Register of Deeds and title searches or court records; abuse can occur if the department allow “other source of information” to be approved by department staff who are not qualified to make land ownership determinations. This Rule modification violates the Mining Act G.S.74-50 (b1).

15A NCAC 05B .0105(2) and (3) – Permit Conditions - REJECT change from “natural buffer” to “vegetated buffer” and reject limiting stream buffers to only those required by State or Local requirements. Stream buffers should remain as natural buffer and not allowed to be disturbed and revegetated. Stream buffers serve to protect against habitat fragmentation, noise, dust, and visual as well as water quality to serve the public interest. Stream buffers currently regulated are for a different purpose than mining. Not all

streams in NC are protected by regulated buffers, but should be protected by mining operations. This change is attempting to allow stream buffer destruction and create new law which should NOT be allowed.

15A NCAC 05B .0111(a) Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “for a modification that adds land to an existing permit.” G.S. 74-51 of the Mining Act indicates that Public Hearings SHALL be held for new mining permits. G.S. 74-52 of the Mining Act indicates permit modifications must meet G.S. 74-51. Thus, all permit modifications, not just modifications that add land, are subject to public hearings when there exists a significant public interest. The Rule should state “If the Department determines that there exists a significant public interest for a new or modified permit, the Director shall appoint a hearing officer to conduct a public hearing on the application...”

15A NCAC 05B .0111(c) Public Comments related to Public Hearings - REJECT added text / added restriction “and no other public comments can be considered in the final determination of an application.” This added text violates the Mining Act, and is inconsistent with current DEQ practice that accepts and considers public comments until a Decision has been reached. Public Comments during a Public Hearing have a deadline in order to allow for the Hearing Report to be completed. Nowhere in the Mining Act are public comments in general limited to only public hearings and currently there is no such practice within DEQ for Mining or any other permits. Public comments, especially after new information is obtained or significant changes are made to an application, are allowed per Law. The Mining Commission is trying to create new law against public interest. These restrictions should be rejected.

15A NCAC 05F .0112 – Further Remedies - do NOT DELETE this Rule. The Direction should be able to enforce the Mining Act.

Thank you for letting me comment, and I hope you have a great day,
Laurie Edgerton
Raleigh, NC

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Natalie Lew <nlew@mindspring.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2026 5:18 PM
To: Miller, Christopher S
Cc: Everett, Jennifer; Ascher, Seth M; Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: RE: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Thank you. I just submitted a written comment as per the instructions below.

-Natalie

Natalie Lew
Sr. Clinical Research Associate (CRA)
Email: nlew@mindspring.com
Cell: 919-812-6446

Learn from the mistakes of others. You can't live long enough to make them all yourself.

From: Miller, Christopher S <christopher.miller@oah.nc.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 11:27 AM
To: Natalie Lew <nlew@mindspring.com>
Cc: Everett, Jennifer <jennifer.everett@deq.nc.gov>; Ascher, Seth M <seth.ascher@oah.nc.gov>; Burgos, Alexander N <alexander.burgos@oah.nc.gov>; Miller, Christopher S <christopher.miller@oah.nc.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

Noted – the WebEx link will be available on our website at <https://www.oah.nc.gov/news/events/rrc-meeting-agenda-july-2026>.

The deadline to submit comments for this meeting is 5:00 pm on July 23, 2026. For additional information, please see rule 26 NCAC 05 .0103.

Chris

Chris Miller
Rules Review Commission Counsel
North Carolina Office of Administrative Hearings | Rules Division
1711 New Hope Church Road
Raleigh, NC 27609
(984) 236-1935

NOTICE: E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by authorized State officials.

From: Natalie Lew <nlew@mindspring.com>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 11:14 AM
To: Miller, Christopher S <christopher.miller@oah.nc.gov>
Cc: Everett, Jennifer <jennifer.everett@deq.nc.gov>; Ascher, Seth M <seth.ascher@oah.nc.gov>; Burgos, Alexander N <alexander.burgos@oah.nc.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Good morning Chris,

Yes, I would like to make a public comment via remote attendance.

I will also submit a written comment. Can you please let me know the deadline for submission of written comments? My apologies if the question has been answered in a separate email!

Thank you!

-Natalie

From: Miller, Christopher S <christopher.miller@oah.nc.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 10:23 AM
To: Natalie Lew <nlew@mindspring.com>
Cc: Everett, Jennifer <jennifer.everett@deq.nc.gov>; Ascher, Seth M <seth.ascher@oah.nc.gov>; Burgos, Alexander N <alexander.burgos@oah.nc.gov>; Miller, Christopher S <christopher.miller@oah.nc.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

Thanks, Seth.

Natalie, these rules are on the schedule for the July RRC meeting. The meeting will be a hybrid of in-person and WebEx attendance and will take place on Thursday, July 30, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. Please let us know if you can make it, and we can add your request to speak on to the agenda.

You can also submit written comments to rrc.comments@oah.nc.gov, which would be included in the record for this month's meeting.

Thanks,
Chris

Chris Miller

Rules Review Commission Counsel
North Carolina Office of Administrative Hearings | Rules Division
1711 New Hope Church Road
Raleigh, NC 27609
(984) 236-1935

NOTICE: E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by authorized State officials.

From: Ascher, Seth M <seth.ascher@oah.nc.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 10:11 AM
To: Natalie Lew <nlew@mindspring.com>; Miller, Christopher S <christopher.miller@oah.nc.gov>
Cc: Everett, Jennifer <jennifer.everett@deq.nc.gov>
Subject: Re: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

Natalie,

I believe the rules you are concerned about are on the July agenda: under item IV.4.

<https://www.oah.nc.gov/news/events/rrc-meeting-agenda-july-2026>

Chris Miller is the staff attorney handling those rules (cc'ed on this email). He would be the best person to coordinate a request to speak or make comment.

Seth Ascher

Counsel to the North Carolina Rules Review Commission
Office of Administrative Hearings
(984) 236-1934

Email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

From: Natalie Lew <nlew@mindspring.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2026 10:32 AM
To: Ascher, Seth M <seth.ascher@oah.nc.gov>
Cc: Everett, Jennifer <jennifer.everett@deq.nc.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Good morning,

Regarding the Mining Commission Rules, below it says they would be on the August or September agenda, but I did receive other emails that says they are on the July agenda. I am planning to make a public comment, but I have had a long planned trip for the last week of July (for educational purposes), so I hope they will be on the August or September agenda. I was told I could make a public comment over the web, but would prefer to do so in person. If at all possible, please have this hearing in August or September.

Thank you,

-Natalie

From: Ascher, Seth M <seth.ascher@oah.nc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2026 11:39 AM
To: nlew@mindspring.com

Cc: Everett, Jennifer <jennifer.everett@deg.nc.gov>

Subject: Re: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

Natalie,

The readoption deadline for those rules is August 1, 2026. That is listed here on our website: <https://www.oah.nc.gov/rule-readoption-schedule> under the 2014-2023 table at the bottom as these were holdovers from the previous decennial review.

I don't know exactly when the rules will be before the RRC, as it is up to the agency to adopt and submit them. My best guess is that they would be on the August or September agenda, but I have cc'ed the agency's rulemaking coordinator (Jennifer Everett) who may be able to provide you with more clarity on their timeline.

Seth Ascher

Counsel to the North Carolina Rules Review Commission
Office of Administrative Hearings
(984) 236-1934

From: Natalie Lew <nlew@mindspring.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2026 3:51 PM

To: Burgos, Alexander N <alexander.burgos@oah.nc.gov>

Subject: [External] May 2026 RRC agenda

You don't often get email from nlew@mindspring.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Good afternoon,

Can you please tell me when the “readoption of 15A NCAC 05A, 05B, 05F, and 05G “Mining Rules” ruleset” will be on the Rules Review Commission agenda? I do not see it listed on the May 2026 agenda.

Thank you,

-Natalie

Natalie Lew

Sr. Clinical Research Associate (CRA)

Email: nlew@mindspring.com

Cell: 919-812-6446

Learn from the mistakes of others. You can't live long enough to make them all yourself.

Email correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.