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**Background**

PolyMet submitted two permit applications to the DNR for Dam Safety Permits for the NorthMet project. One application was for the Flotation Tailings Basin and the other was for the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility (HRF).

To supplement the review process, the DNR requested that a team of top experts (EOR Review Team) be assembled to assess and comment on the proposed design, operation and maintenance of the facilities. The review approach focused on key elements similar to tailings basin review panels required by law in Montana and other western states. The review process included the following tasks:

- **Documents Review** – Including PolyMet’s Dam Safety Permits applications, related technical documents, and comment tracking sheets.

- **Site Visit and Discussion** - Trip to Hoyt Lakes to develop observations and take field notes at the LTV/PolyMet tailings basin and proposed HRF sites. Meet with PolyMet and the tailings basin hydro designers to ask questions and discuss the different design elements.

- **Review Meetings** – Internal review meetings between EOR Review Team and DNR to discuss initial findings, need for additional information and develop final comments and recommendations. Meeting with PolyMet, DNR and the EOR Review Team to discuss final findings.


**EOR Review Team**

EOR assembled a Review Team of experienced experts in mining geotechnical engineering. The Review Team included:

- **Dirk van Zyl, PhD, PE**. Dirk is on the faculty of the University of British Columbia and consults with mining companies worldwide on tailings basin design. He was formerly on the faculty of the University of Nevada – Reno, and he has worked for several consulting companies. Dr. van Zyl has authored or co-authored over 120 papers on mining topics, including tailings basin management. He currently serves on several review panels in Montana and on the review panel that previously investigated the Mt. Polley dam failure.
- **Steve Gale, PE.** Steve is the President of Gale-Tec Engineering Inc. in Minneapolis, Minnesota. He has over 30 years of experience working as a geotechnical engineer. Mr. Gale and his company provide consulting services on all aspects of tailings basin design, management, and closure, including dam safety analysis and permitting. He has worked on many of the tailings basins on Minnesota’s Iron Range.

Resumes are included in Attachment 1.

**Review Process**

The EOR Review Team went through the following documents:


The EOR Team (along with the DNR, PolyMet and Barr Engineering) conducted a site visit to the LTV tailings basin site and proposed HRF facility in September 29th, 2016. The EOR Review Team also met with PolyMet and Barr Engineering to discuss comments and questions on the proposed NorthMet project. A follow up meeting to discuss and review comments was held with the same participants at DNR headquarters on December 5th, 2016. The EOR Review Team and DNR met on several occasions to discuss the review's status.

**Review Comments**

The detailed EOR Review Team comments are presented in the review tables of Attachment 2. The columns on the tables include:

- **Comment/Concern** - These initial comments were written by the EOR Review Team, reviewed by DNR, and submitted to PolyMet in December, 2016.
- **PolyMet Response** - PolyMet provided these written and/or verbal responses to the initial comments.
- **Final Comments** - After considering PolyMet’s response, the EOR Review Team prepared these comments contained in this column.
- **Recommendations** - The EOR Review Team recommends that the comments and issues be addressed as follows:
  - **Address Pre-Permit** - These issues will require additional information before a permit can be issued. This may require resubmittal of the complete permit application.
**Address Post-Permit & Make Condition of Permit** - These issues require additional information, but they are not likely to have a bearing on the DNR’s decision to grant or deny the permit. They may affect future construction and operation of the facilities. Some of these comments can only be addressed while the facilities are operating. PolyMet must address these comments if the permit is granted.

**Address Pre-Construction** - These issues also require additional information, but they are not likely to have a bearing on the DNR’s decision to grant or deny the permit. PolyMet must provide more information before beginning construction of the facility if the permit is granted.

**Condition of Permit Recommendation** - The EOR Review Team provides elements and recommended language to be incorporated into the permit, either pre-permit or as a condition of the permit.

### Comments on PolyMet’s Design, Approach and Redevelopment of the LTV Tailings Basin

#### Observational Method (Comments #1, #4, #5 and #7 in Attachment 2)

The Observational Method is a well-documented and often-used approach to tailings dam construction and maintenance. The Observational Method steps are:

1. Predict behavior with detailed calculations,
2. Design with contingencies,
3. Construct with monitoring and
4. Compare measurements with predictions and redesign if necessary.

The EOR Review Team agrees that the Observational Method can and should be used during construction, but it is not a substitute for careful initial design. The EOR Team concluded that the permit application lacks the detail and description of contingencies for the Observational Method to be effective. If monitoring data indicate a potentially unsafe condition during construction, then the alternate construction methods and designs (contingencies) must be already in place so that they can be implemented immediately.

#### Peat Layers and Slimes Layers (Comments #3, #4 and #7 in Attachment 2)

The former LTV tailings basin was constructed over layers of peat in some areas. Layers of slimes (very fine-grained taconite tailings) were also included in the construction of the tailings basin dam. Both peat layers and slimes layers have very low shear strength, which could potentially contribute to a dam failure. The tailings basin can be designed to safely mitigate for these conditions, but the areas with peat and slimes must be well-defined and tested. The EOR Team commented that additional data should be gathered on the peat layers and slime layers, and that the design may need to be modified in the future in accordance with the Observational Method.

#### Cement Deep Soil Mixing (CDSM) & Dam Toe Buttressing (Comments #2 and #11 in Attachment 2)

In the permit application, PolyMet proposed constructing the dam with both CDSM and dam toe buttressing (reinforcement usually using waste rock). CDSM uses large-diameter drills to drill into the base of the tailings basin dam and mix Portland cement with the existing materials. Placing of these CDSM “pillars” close together in a line creates a kind of shear wall that increases the shear strength of the material. The construction needs to be carefully monitored in the subsurface to make
sure that the pillars are constructed as designed. CDSM is often used in the construction of embankments and dams, but to our knowledge has not been used in a tailings basin.

Dam toe buttressing places heavy materials at the toe of the tailings basin dam to prevent the toe of the dam from sliding and causing a dam failure. The required size and weight of the buttress increase as the height of the dam increases.

The EOR Review Team commented that additional monitoring would be required during CDSM construction and during operations and closure to assess the effectiveness of the CDSM. Since then, PolyMet has removed CDSM from the design plans in favor of using larger dam toe buttresses. The design plans with additional buttresses will have several advantages:

- The technology is better understood on tailings basin dams,
- Construction and maintenance are above ground, so critical observation and monitoring can be done with greater confidence, and
- The buttress can be constructed incrementally over an extended period of time, whereas the CDSM must be fully completed prior to placing the basin into service.

Peat deposits should be removed near the toe of the existing tailings basin dam so that the new buttress will have a solid footing. If peat deposits are not fully removed, the EOR Review Team commented that additional analysis should be required to evaluate the stability of the buttress toe that may be constructed over localized soft soils. PolyMet indicated that buttress construction will specify the complete removal of peat soils. The EOR Review Team also recommended performing additional analysis for other potential impacts due to additional wetland fill or the geochemistry of the buttress material.

**Water Ponding (Comment #5 in Attachment 2)**

As currently designed, a pond of water will be maintained on top of the tailings basin in perpetuity. During mining operations, the residue from the processing plant (tailings) is pumped to the pond as slurry, and water is returned to the plant after the tailings settle out. PolyMet developed stability analysis models that show the volume and location of the pond at various times during the operating life of the tailings basin. This stability analysis was based on maintaining a beach length of 625 feet between the inside crest of the dam and the edge of the water within the tailings basin. This would minimize the potential for the water to rise and cause erosion at the edge of the basin.

The EOR Review Team commented that some of the model runs did not seem to correctly account for a potential rise in water levels, the location of the beach around the pond, and the distance to the edge of the tailings basin. PolyMet indicated that the design included a 4 feet head increase while still keeping the water pond at a 625 feet distance from the crest of the perimeter dike. The EOR Review Team recommended that a water pocket distance of less than 625 feet (or in direct contact with the tailings dam) be analyzed as an event/condition of the Observational Method approach.

**Existing Structures (Comment #6 in Attachment 2)**

The EOR Review Team commented that some of the existing structures associated with the existing tailings basin had not been specifically addressed in the plan for future construction. The EOR Team
recommended that the permit includes language that requires all existing structures to be investigated and properly abandoned before construction to ensure that dike stability is maintained.

**Bentonite Addition (Comment #8 in Attachment 2)**
To minimize water seepage from the tailings basin, bentonite will be added to the soils at the top of the basin during the closure and reclamation process. The permit application only lists alternatives for placing the bentonite that will be pilot tested and field tested later. The EOR Review Team commented on specific elements that should be included in the field testing that would impact the permeability of the bentonite amended tailings. Once the preferred bentonite application method is selected, the EOR Review Team recommended developing material and installation specifications and a detailed protocol for both a laboratory and a field pilot study.

**Statistical Analyses (Comment #9 in Attachment 2)**
Geotechnical tests were performed to determine the shear strength of the tailings at hundreds of locations around the existing tailings basin. Statistical analyses are used to calculate the overall strength and stability of the basin. EOR Review Team commented that some of the geotechnical test results (i.e. low coarse tailings friction angles) were excluded from the statistical analyses. Because of their importance in the overall stability of the basin, the EOR Review Team recommended that coarse tailings friction angles be considered as a variable condition in the Observational Method process. This would also provide a consistent and proper procedure for future analyses.

It should be noted that including all the geotechnical results in the statistical analyses did not significantly reduce the global factor of safety. Nevertheless, the EOR Review Team recommended using the Observational Method to enhance instrumentation and monitoring at those discrete cross sections where lower friction angles could occur. If lower friction angles are observed, the statistical analysis must be rerun to verify that this localized factor of safety is still acceptable.

**Wet Closure vs. Dry Closure (Comment #10 in Attachment 2)**
Wet closure of the tailings basin is currently proposed, meaning that the top of the tailings basin will have a permanent pool of water on top of the basin. Wet closure has ongoing costs like; maintaining water levels to prevent flooding and drying out, erosion repair, treatment of discharged water and on-going monitoring. Dry closure (no water ponding) requires a greater initial investment, but has much lower ongoing maintenance costs and less long-term environmental risk.

The EOR Review Team did not proposed dry closure as a permit requirement at this time. The EOR Review Team recommended that if the wet closure is permitted, the DNR should require PolyMet to continually review the current state-of-the-practice for dry closure techniques prior to starting any tailings basin closure activities.

**General Discussion of Issues – HydroMet Residue Facility**

**Stability of Underlying Soils (Comment #1 and #2 in Attachment 2)**
The soft ground beneath the proposed residue facility consists of up to 30 feet of slimes, peat and tailings concentrate. This will not be an adequate foundation for the 80 foot high basin. Three potential remediation alternatives have been considered:
• Pre-loading the existing material with 50 feet of rock and soil to compress and consolidate the underlying material. This is the method currently proposed by PolyMet.
• Installing wick drains that will allow water to flow out of the existing material, thereby increasing its shear strength.
• Removing the existing material and any soft soils before constructing the basin.

The basin will have a geomembrane or geosynthetic liner. The liner could deform and fail if the existing underlying material cannot support the material added to the basin.

The EOR Review Team commented that the proposed pre-load design should be re-evaluated to determine if it will adequately surcharge and compress the existing material.

**Geomembrane (Comment #3 in Attachment 2)**

The EOR Review Team commented that more information was required in the permit application to evaluate the geomembrane liner system. Barr Engineering provided the information, so this issue has been closed.
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Attachment 2 – Comment Tables
# Review of PolyMet’s Tailings Basin Permit Application: Tailings Basin Dam

Reviewers: Dirk Van Zyl, Steve Gale/Nate Lichty - Gale Tec Engineering, Inc. and Stu Grubb/Cecilio Olivier - Emmons Olivier Resources, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section or Table Number</th>
<th>Comment/Concern</th>
<th>PolyMet Response</th>
<th>Final Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Geotech Report - page 123</td>
<td>Section 9 - Operat. &amp; Mainten.</td>
<td>The Management Plan calls for the design and/or the operation to be modified based on operational experience using the Observational Method. We recommend that this approach be defined in the Permit similar to that included in a paper &quot;Liquefaction of Tailings Dams&quot; by Soleng, P.B. - Barr Engineering Company presented/published for a &quot;Liquefaction of Mining Tailings&quot; symposium in Cleveland, Ohio - 1997. The Barr paper details that the Observational Method concept design should include: 1) Predict behavior with detailed calculations, 2) design with contingencies, 3) construct with monitoring and 4) compare measurements with predictions and redesign if necessary. The Geotechnical Report Section 2.1-page 5 states that this method is used for all MDNR-Permitted Tailings Basins. If the Observational Method is to be permitted, we recommend that the plan include a design at the time of permitting and identify what instrumentation will be installed, where the instrumentation will be installed and what the instrumentation will monitor (e.g. excess pore water pressures and tailings dam deformations). If the Observational Method is permitted, we recommend that the permit require stability evaluations be submitted at least yearly with the annual Dam Safety Report. If a significant design change is required, we recommend that the company apply for a permit amendment.</td>
<td>Further clarification on the details of the Observational Methods were requested.</td>
<td>The Observational Method (Peck, R.B., Geotechnique, No. 2, 1969) is based on assessing potential geotechnical failure modes that may result during/post construction as well as conditions and events that could instigate instability. An example condition could be a previously undiscovered layer of soft soil beneath the dike alignment. An example event may be a large rainfall that causes increased seepage and slope toe erosion. After this assessment is complete and critical failure modes and conditions/events are identified and analyzed, contingency plans should be developed for each critical failure mode. We recommend this analysis be performed prior to construction. With the analysis results in mind, a monitoring system (geotechnical instrumentation, site reviews, etc.) should be developed and implemented during construction to monitor dike performance. The monitoring system would be used to confirm assumptions made during original design or to change operations/design if field observations and adverse measurements are recorded. We recommend that to adequately use this method for dike construction, that a geotechnical instrumentation and monitoring plan should be developed based on the results of the dike stability analysis that considers conditions/events that could result in localized or complete dike instability. Contingency plans should be developed for each critical condition. The instrumentation and monitoring plan should include 1) a list of geotechnical instruments that will be installed, where they will be installed and what they will be measuring, 2) how often the instrumentation readings be taken, 3) who will review the instrumentation readings, 4) what the typical values will be and what the thresholds will be that indicate &quot;adverse conditions&quot; that will require a change in operation or design. The contingency plan should include a list of potential adverse conditions that may occur and what would be observed if that condition occurred. The plan should include different operational/design options to address the adverse conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section or Table Number</td>
<td>Comment/Concern</td>
<td>PolyMet Response</td>
<td>Final Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Geotech Report - page 8</td>
<td>Section 3.2 - Tailings Basin Develop.</td>
<td>The Report describes various peat layer thicknesses and various slime layer thicknesses beneath the Cell2E North perimeter dam. Sitka Corporation identified typical standard penetration resistance value (blow/foot) for the slimes was 5 or less and for the fine tailings in the range of 15-20. We recommend that the layer thicknesses and the continuity of the layers be further investigated and a sensitivity analysis be performed based on the thickness, continuity and the liquefied shear strength values. A USSR liq=0.10 is included in Table 5-10 (page 41) for the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes and further alludes to this value being a minimum to be used for design by the Engineering and Design Manual - Coal Refuse Disposal Facilities published by U.S. Department of Labor - MSHA. Further documentation should be provided for this value: and a sensitivity analysis should be performed in conjunction with the previously described parameters. Sitka Corporation found remolded vane shear strength values of the slimes to be in the range of 100 - 300 pounds per square foot. These low remolded vane shear strength values could indicate a USSR liq less than 0.10. These lower values could result in a factor of safety of less than 1.1.</td>
<td>Slope stability sensitivity analyses to evaluate variation in material strength has been performed and reported in GDP Vol 1, Sections 6.6 and 7.3.8. Affirmation of selected strength parameters will be performed following acquisition of additional strength data during post-permit installation of instrumentation.</td>
<td>The additional subsurface exploration and instrumentation &amp; monitoring plan should be developed based on the results of the analysis performed as part of the Observational Method process Part 1. The plan should include what instrument type is required, its location, depth and expected range of values that will be obtained during basin construction. This plan should be incorporated into the submittal discussed as part of Comment 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Geotech Report - page 41</td>
<td>Section 5.2.3 - Shear Strength of LTVSMC Tailings and Table 5-10</td>
<td>The additional subsurface exploration, performed post permit, and development of the Instrumentation and Monitoring Plan should be based on the analysis of critical failure modes as associated with Comment 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Review of PolyMet's Tailings Basin Permit Application: Tailings Basin Dam

Reviewers: Dirk Van Zyl, Steve Gale/Nate Lichty - Gale Tec Engineering, Inc. and Stu Grubb/Cecilio Olivier - Emmons Olivier Resources, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section or Table Number</th>
<th>Comment/Concern</th>
<th>PolyMet Response</th>
<th>Final Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Geotech Report - page 8</td>
<td>Section 2.2 - Tailings Basin Develop.</td>
<td>The Report describes a layer of peat over a deposit of glacial till beneath the Cell 2E North perimeter dam. During the retreat of the glaciers approx. 10,000 years ago, depressions were formed in which lacustrine clay and peat were deposited. The Geotech Report, however, does not reference any lacustrine clay layers, only peat over glacial till. Table 5-24 (page 64) identifies peat with a USSR yield = 0.23. This value may be appropriate for a fibrous peat but not for a decomposed amorphous peat or a high plasticity lacustrine clay. The soil types should be further investigated and sensitivity analysis performed for a range of shear strengths. Geotech Report - page 49, Section 5.4.2.2, states that previous testing by Sitka resulted in higher permeability values for peat than that obtained from samples during the most recent 2014 investigation. This may indicate a different type of peat at various locations.</td>
<td>Same as Recommendation for Comment 3</td>
<td>The additional subsurface exploration and instrumentation &amp; monitoring plan should be based on the results of the analysis performed as part of the Observational Method process Part 1. The results of this analysis should be used to develop the basin's instrumentation and monitoring plan. The plan should include what instrument type is required, its location, depth and expected range of values that will be obtained during basin's construction. This plan should be incorporated into the submittal discussed as part of Comment 1.</td>
<td>X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mgmt. Plan - page 22-24</td>
<td>Section 4.2 - Transport and Deposit. Plan</td>
<td>It appears that the stability analysis was based on maintaining a beach length of 625 feet between the inside crest of the dam and the edge of the water within the tailing basin. The water pocket could, at sometime during the operation, be closer to the dam than the 625 feet. Stability and exit seepage should be evaluated considering the water pocket closer or in contact with the tailings dam.</td>
<td>Addressed - have reviewed high pond conditions as shown in GDP Vol 1, Section 7.3.3.2 and supporting Sections</td>
<td>The analysis included a four foot head increase to the tailings basin water level while moving the water pond interface with the perimeter dike from 625 feet away to 150 feet away. Consistent with the Observational Method approach, a Contingency Plan should be prepared for instances when the water pocket is closer than 150 feet away from the inside crest of the dike. The April, 2017 Contingency Action Plan submitted by PolyMet/Barr should be updated to address this concern.</td>
<td>X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mgmt. Plan - page 34</td>
<td>Section 7.3 - Structure Removals</td>
<td>The Management Plan is vague regarding abandonment of existing structures within the tailings basin and assumes that the previous owner properly abandoned all pipes within the basin which could be a conduit for water which could create erosion conditions which could then act as a trigger for liquefaction and induce a flow failure. Specifically, the 9 foot diameter drop inlet decant structure constructed in Basin 2W and the approximate 2000 lineal feet of 40 inch diameter spiral pipe extending into Basin 1E should be addressed.</td>
<td>This will be addressed post-permitting; prior to reactivation of the basin</td>
<td>If not investigated pre-permit, we recommend that the dam safety permit include language that requires all existing pipes/structures to be investigated and properly abandoned to ensure dike stability is maintained.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Geotech Report - page 90</td>
<td>Section 6.6.1 - Range and Dist. of Shear Strength Values</td>
<td>The Report identifies that sensitivity analyses were performed for the USSR properties for most of the soils using either a normal or log-normal distribution. However, a sensitivity analysis was apparently not performed for liquefied shear strength ratio (USSR) for the slimes. The Report identifies that based on previous geotechnical workshops, a single estimate of that particular strength was chosen. Apparently, the chosen ratio is 0.10. Using this ratio, 40 feet of overburden would result in a liquefied shear strength of 600 pounds per square foot. Residual vane shear testing has shown slimes values as low as 100 - 300 pounds per square foot, which would result in a ratio of less than 0.10. We recommend that this issue be further explored.</td>
<td>Affirmation of selected strength parameters will be performed following acquisition of additional strength data during post-permit installation of instrumentation.</td>
<td>The additional subsurface exploration and instrumentation &amp; monitoring plan should be based on the results of the analysis performed as part of the Observational Method process Part 1. The results of this analysis should be used to develop the basin instrumentation and monitoring plan. The plan should include what instrument type is required, its location, depth and expected range of values that will be obtained during basin construction. This plan should be incorporated into the submittal discussed as part of Comment 1.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The additional subsurface exploration and monitoring plan should be included and analyzed as part of the Observational Method and be as part of the submittal associated with Comment 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mgmt. Plan - page 37</td>
<td>Section 7.2 - Final Reclamat.</td>
<td>The Plan identifies approximately 3% bentonite by dry weight to be added to the fine tailings beach to a depth of 18 inches and then overlain by 30 additional inches of tailings and then vegetated. The 3% by dry weight addition should be further investigated based on field trials, not laboratory testing in which very controlled conditions exist. Closure of the pond bottom refers the Geotechnical Report reader to the Adaptive Water Management Plan - Version 7. The effectiveness of injecting bentonite through the pond water is subject to concern with regard to reliability of the infiltration reduction.</td>
<td>Pilot testing/field tests are already incorporated in closure construction specifications (FTMP, Attachment G, Section 03100)</td>
<td>A plan should be developed that requires test sections be constructed on both the pond bottom and tailings dike side slope to evaluate the chosen means for bentonite inclusion. The test section evaluation should consider: onsite water chemistry, potential for ice scour along the shoreline, oxidation of sulfide bearing rock within side slopes, and other concepts which may impact the permeability of the bentonite amended tailings.</td>
<td>Perform test sections for each bentonite application technology prior to tailings dike closure. A report should be submitted with test results and a QA/QC program demonstrating that the bentonite-tailings mixture has adequate permeability.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Address Pre-Permit:** The additional subsurface exploration and monitoring plan should be included and analyzed as part of the Observational Method and be as part of the submittal associated with Comment 1.
- **Address Post-Permit & Make Condition of Permit:** The additional subsurface exploration and monitoring plan should be included and analyzed as part of the Observational Method and be as part of the submittal associated with Comment 1.
- **Address Pre-constr.:** Perform test sections for each bentonite application technology prior to tailings dike closure. A report should be submitted with test results and a QA/QC program demonstrating that the bentonite-tailings mixture has adequate permeability.
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<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Geotech Data Package, Vol. 3, Attach. C, page 19</td>
<td>Section 3.0 - Drained Shear Strength Paramet.</td>
<td>The shear strength data for the different materials was evaluated by considering laboratory shear strength data plus interpreted field shear strength data from various tests as appropriate. The 33rd percentile of the resulting data was then selected for the stability analyses. In the case of the drained shear strength of the LTVSMC coarse tailings, the shear strength ranges are: laboratory testing 28 to 47 degrees, SPT testing 26 to 50 degrees and CPT testing 39 to 46 degrees (outliers below 30 degrees, to as low as 32 degrees were excluded, Figure A-3). The resulting value selected for stability analysis from the statistical analysis is 38.5 degrees. This value seems on the high side as lab testing and SPT testing values in the high 20's are included in the evaluation while lower values of the CPT testing were excluded. Furthermore, the drained shear strength selected for the coarse tailings is higher than that selected for glacial till - typically a well graded material that is very dense. The angularity of the coarse tailings particles might have played a role in the selection of this higher value. It is recommended that the stability analysis should also be done with a lower shear strength value, say 36 degrees, for the coarse tailings as part of a sensitivity analysis. It is recognized that this may not change the outcome very much, however this sensitivity analysis is an important aspect of developing further confidence in the effective strength stability results.</td>
<td>A sensitivity analysis will be performed to review the effect of the lower friction angles on dike stability. Strength data will also be further investigated during instrumentation installation.</td>
<td>The Dec. 30, 2016 Barr Memorandum identified no substantial reduction in the tailings dike global factor of safety by lowering the coarse tailings friction angle from 38.5 deg. to 36 deg. We question why some of the data was excluded from the statistical analysis and recommend that the coarse tailings friction angle be considered as a variable condition in the Observation Method process. At cross sections where lower friction angles result in lower factors of safety, the Observational Method would suggest enhanced instrumentation and monitoring at these locations. This analysis should be incorporated into the submittal discussed as part of Comment 1.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Section 7.2 - Final Reclamat.</td>
<td>PolyMet is proposing a 20 year mine life and “wet closure” for the tailings basin. The proposed design is permittable and if permitted, would need to be managed in compliance with all rules and regulations including financial assurance. If permitted, the DNR should also require PolyMet to continually review the current state-of-the-practice for design techniques prior to starting any tailings basin closure activities. Information should be reviewed so that the decision on the best closure design option, accounts for current technologies, for environmental protections and considers the long term cost of operation. Extended study of tailings basin closure designs should also be considered as a permit condition. If a closure design change is required in the future, it must meet all environmental review and permitting standards.</td>
<td>PolyMet will continue to evaluate potential project improvements during operations and at closure, one of which may be revisiting the tailings closure approach.</td>
<td>The review team is not ready to commit to a dry closure requirement. Wet closure will be more difficult and costly to manage for the long-term and it must be determined if this commitment is acceptable.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barr Memo Dec. 30, 2016 on Tailings Basin Cell 2E Buttress Design as Alternate to CDSM</td>
<td>The modified buttress design includes increasing the buttress height by 35 ft to a total height of 84 ft above the surrounding grade. This increased height will require the buttress slope toe to extend approx. 100 ft more into the wetland than what was previously proposed (200-250 ft total). The stability analyses presented are limited to global failure planes through the entire tailings dike. The stability analyses indicate that the peat will be removed from beneath the buttress. Localized stability of the buttress toe with a failure plane extending out into the virgin peat soils does not seem to have been evaluated. This localized failure could be significant in that it could result in a progressive failure into the buttress. The results of the stability analysis should be used to determine the buttress toe design. Potential adverse environmental effects associated with the buttress fill (e.g. wetland fill and geochemistry of the Area 5 material) will also need to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section or Table Number</td>
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<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mgmt. Plan - page 10</td>
<td>Section 2.2.2</td>
<td>The 80 foot high residue storage facility will be constructed over potentially soft ground. The management plan addresses shear strength gain and settlement of the soft soils but does not commit to a construction plan stating that the Observational Method will be used to assess what type of construction needs to take place in the future. Since the soft foundation soils already exist in place, these soils should be further tested and further evaluated such that a design can be promulgated. The pre-load method should be evaluated and a determination made if the pre-load will induce shear strength gain of the soft deposit and whether external drainage, such as wick drains, would be required. It is our opinion that the Observational Method requires a design be presented at the time of permit application.</td>
<td>The need for wick drains is dictated by schedule; the time available for pre-load construction relative to required in-service date for the HRF. The wick drains are not necessary for dam stability.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See Comment No. 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mgmt. Plan - page 8</td>
<td>Section 2.2.2.1 - Liner and Leachate Collection System Design</td>
<td>The HydroMet residue basin will consist of a double liner with an internal leakage collection system. Since this system is susceptible to rupture as a result of strains in the geomembrane or geosynthetic liner as a result of settlement or other localized conditions, we recommend that the pre-load/wick drain system be further evaluated and a design promulgated for review during permit.</td>
<td>Deformation and impacts on liner were presented in GDP Vol D, Sections 5.4 and 6.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See Comment 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mgmt. Plan - page 33 and 34</td>
<td>Section 7.2.2</td>
<td>The management plan identifies that the HydroMet closure will include a 40 mil LDPE membrane or a MPCA approved geomembrane and a geosynthetic clay liner (GCL) constructed over a working platform. As far as we know, the MPCA does not have an approved geomembrane list. They do have a guidance on their website. We recommend that the liner type be further investigated and the proposed liner be identified and detailed at permit.</td>
<td>The proposed 40 mil LDPE liner is detailed in the RMP, Section 2.2 and Attachments A and G.</td>
<td>This issue can be closed.</td>
<td>Design of the preload shall be required to reduce the potential for differential settlement and excess strain in the liner due to the underlying soft soils considering variable soil properties and variable deposit depths. It is recommended that this design be evaluated and approved prior to Preload/HRF construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>